

# MOSAICS OF TIME

STUDIES IN THE EARLY MIDDLE AGES

*Editorial Board under the auspices of the  
Centre for Medieval Studies, University of York*

Elizabeth M. Tyler, *University of York*  
Julian D. Richards, *University of York*  
Ross Balzaretti, *University of Nottingham*

Laura Napran (Editorial Assistant)

Previously published volumes in this series are listed at the back of this book

VOLUME 33

MOSAICS OF TIME  
The Latin Chronicle Traditions  
from the First Century BC to the Sixth Century AD

Volume I:  
A Historical Introduction to the Chronicle Genre  
from its Origins to the High Middle Ages

by

R. W. Burgess  
and Michael Kulikowski



BREPOLS

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

Burgess, R. W. (Richard W.)

Mosaics of time : Latin chronicle traditions from the first century BC to the sixth century AD.

Volume 1, A historical introduction to the chronicle genre from its origins to the High Middle Ages. – (Studies in the early Middle Ages ; v. 33)

1. Chronology, Historical. 2. Chronology, Roman. 3. Civilization, Ancient – Early works to 1800. 4. Civilization, Medieval – Early works to 1800. 5. Latin prose literature – History and criticism. 6. Historiography – History – To 1500.

I. Title II. Series III. Kulikowski, Michael, 1970–  
907.2-dc23

ISBN-13: 9782503531403

© 2013, Brepols Publishers n.v., Turnhout, Belgium

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the prior permission of the publisher.

D/2013/0095/72

ISBN: 978-2-503-53140-3

Printed on acid-free paper

Tum Atticus: '[...] sed quid tandem habuit liber iste quod tibi aut nouum aut tanto usui posset esse?'

'Ille uero et noua', inquam, 'mihi quidem multa et eam utilitatem quam requirebam, ut explicatis ordinibus temporum uno in conspectu omnia uiderem.'

Then Atticus said, 'But what did [my chronicle] have that could have been either new or so useful to you?'

'It did indeed have both many things that were new to me', I replied, 'and the specific usefulness I was looking for: I could see everything in chronological order at a single glance.'

M. Tullius Cicero, *Brutus*, 14–15

### Cover Image

The objects in this photo seem to be about as different as they can be — monochromatic vs colour, fired clay vs vellum, Babylonian vs Latin, inscribed cuneiform vs written letters, three-dimensional tablet vs flat page, sixth century BC vs thirteenth century AD (copied), and seventh century BC vs eleventh century AD (content) — and yet in spite of the thousands of years that separate their creation they are both recognizably chronicles and they cover approximately the same amount of time.

*Left image:* The Fall of Nineveh Chronicle, a cuneiform tablet with part of the Babylonian Chronicle covering years ten to eighteen of King Nabopolassar, i.e. 616–609 BC (= Grayson 1975: 90–96, no. 3, and Glassner 2004: 218–25, no. 22; size: 136.5 mm x 71.4 mm), inscribed between *c.* 609 and 539 BC.

*Right image:* A page from the chronicle of Sigebert of Gembloux, covering the years AD 1088–93 (= MGH SS, 6: 366), written in the late thirteenth century.

## CONTENTS

Foreword	ix
A Note on the Citation of Ancient and Medieval Editions	xiv
Chapter 1. Nomenclature and Genre	1
Chapter 2. Early Chronicles in the Mediterranean World	63
Chapter 3. Apologetic Chronography and the Chronographic Works of Eusebius	99
Chapter 4. The Early Development of Calendars and Consularia	133
Chapter 5. Consularia and Chronicles in the Later Roman Empire	173
Chapter 6. Chronicles in the Middle Ages	189
Conclusion	269
Appendices	275
1. The Origin of the Term Χρονικά/ <i>Chronica</i>	278
2. The Meaning of the Word <i>Annales</i>	288
3. Excerpts from Babylonian Chronicles	297
4. Excerpts from Pre-Christian Greek Chronicles	301
5. Excerpts from Roman Consularia and Chronicles	317
6. The Newly Published Leipzig Chronograph	336

7. Eusebius's Sources for Secular History and the Identities of Cassius Longinus and Thallus	343
8. Livy's Foundation Date	354
Appendices to the Footnotes	357
Editions and Translations of Important Texts	383
Bibliography	389
Index	417



## FOREWORD

This series of four volumes has had a long and complicated genesis. Early in 1989, shortly after RWB had completed his Oxford DPhil and as he was preparing an edition of Hydatius for publication, Margaret Gibson asked him to translate and provide a short commentary on Hydatius for the then new Liverpool series, Translated Texts for Historians. Serious work on the TTH volume was delayed by a full-time teaching job in Ottawa and the edition of Hydatius, which appeared with a facing-page translation in 1993. By then his plan for the TTH volume had changed. Because Hydatius continues the chronicle of Jerome and because that fact of continuation is so vital to understanding both Hydatius and other chroniclers that to present their work as isolated texts is to fundamentally misrepresent them, RWB now planned to begin his TTH volume with Jerome's chronicle from AD 284 (the accession of Diocletian and the date from which the then recent TTH translation of the *Chronicon Paschale* begins). With the addition of Prosper, the collection of one first-generation and two second-generation chronicles would form a primer of the late Roman chronicle, if paired with extensive introductions and commentaries. This plan for an introduction to the Latin chronicle tradition soon grew to take in the parallel tradition of Latin consularia (the *Descriptio consulium* and the bundle of texts named the Consularia Italica by Mommsen). Meanwhile two appendices to the commentary on Jerome evolved into a completely separate book, published in 1999. Continued concentrated work on translation and commentaries began during a sabbatical year in 1998, while companion volumes on Greek and Syriac chronicles and an appendix on the early tradition of epigraphic fasti and consularia were also conceived. By 2002 the project had grown far beyond anything TTH could accommodate within its rigid format. RWB nevertheless decided to move forward with the larger project on the Latin tradition from epigraphical consularia to Cassiodorus.

It was at this point that MK first became involved in the project. Because RWB had done little work on Hydatius for more than a decade, and because MK's Toronto PhD thesis on Roman Spain (published in a much expanded form in 2004) was centrally concerned with the period covered by Hydatius, RWB invited MK to contribute the Hydatius commentary to the larger work. In 2004, after MK had agreed to the proposal and provided lengthy suggestions on the many hundreds of draft pages accumulated over a decade and a half, he came on board as a full co-author. By that year, much of the material in Volumes I and II of the series existed in draft, some very rough, some structurally close to what appears in the published version (only Chapter 6, the Appendices, and the Conclusion of the present volume are wholly new work completed since our collaboration began). MK therefore began the Herculean task of reworking years of accumulated verbiage (amounting to around three hundred thousand words) and, as he put it, 'translating it into English'. He was also instrumental in finding and securing our publisher, Brepols, whose editors suggested that we include Latin editions for each of the translations.

Finally, in Ireland in 2008, we realized the fundamental importance of putting our existing research on the ancient world into a context that could be used by medievalists, while also introducing fundamental continuities in medieval chronicle traditions to the specialists in earlier periods whom we had originally envisaged as our primary audience. To that end, MK composed the sixth and final chapter of this first volume, which takes the story of chronographic historical literature that began in the ancient Near East all the way forward to the twelfth century AD. In order to accommodate the vastly extended time frame of this narrative section, we also settled on the four-volume series now projected. This, the first volume, is a historical introduction to the chronicle genre as a whole from its beginnings to the twelfth century. The second, which is largely complete in a draft state as this volume goes to press, will treat the early Latin chronicle tradition; the epigraphic calendars, fasti, and consularia of the early empire; and the Latin consularia tradition of late antiquity and will include Latin editions, translations, and full historical commentaries on the late antique material in those texts. The third volume will treat the chronicle of Jerome and its direct continuations in Gaul and Spain. The fourth and final volume will cover the last chroniclers of late antiquity through to the very early seventh century and will include addenda, corrigenda, and an index to all four volumes.

The distribution of labour between the authors will differ across the volumes. As far as this volume is concerned, in spite of what has been said above about the development of early drafts, MK has contributed substantially to every chapter that

existed in draft when he agreed to be a co-author, not only putting his own stylistic stamp on nearly every paragraph and sentence, but also adding new ideas and opening up new avenues of research. Indeed, this whole first volume was no more than a single (very) long chapter before he set to work on it. Without his collaboration, this volume and this series would not exist. That said, the project as conceived and executed is a case in which the alphabetical listing of the authors' names also reflects their relative importance to its execution.

This series has four chief goals. The first is to provide the Latinless with reasonable translations of nearly all the most important chronographical sources in Latin for the fourth, fifth, and sixth centuries AD. The only major text omitted is that of Marcellinus *comes*, since Brian Croke has produced admirable studies of that chronicle already. The little that needs to be added (on Marcellinus's sources) will appear in Volume II. These translations are meant to facilitate the use of the original Latin texts but are not substitutes for them. Both authors would insist that ancient history cannot be done properly without a solid grounding in Latin and Greek.

Second, in furtherance of that goal, Latin and Greek texts have been provided for every translation from Volume II onwards. Where useful and possible, new editions will be provided. In other cases, we shall print a *textus receptus*. It is hoped that these texts will form the basis of new critical editions to be published by RWB in the CCSL series.

Our third goal is to provide a general introduction to ancient chronographical genres from their beginnings to their medieval transformation, as well as individual introductions to and commentaries on the ancient and late antique Latin chronicle and consularia traditions. All texts of this sort are difficult and often obscure, and have thus been too often ignored, misunderstood, or worse yet, treated as anonymous repositories of 'facts' cited simply by their *Chronica minora* page numbers. Making these texts available and comprehensible to a wider audience may help to rehabilitate their reputation. We intend our introductions and commentaries to serve as a guide to the composition, sources, and transmission of these texts for anyone, student or scholar, who comes to work with them in future.

Our fourth and final goal is therefore to provide in our commentaries enough historical background to render the rebarbative evidence of our texts useable by non-specialists. It is the nature of the chronicle genre to provide a great deal of information in a very small space, which in turn precludes a detailed historical commentary for the whole period covered by many of our texts: sometimes thousands of years of history and legend. In many places, we shall do no more than provide quick references to more comprehensive discussion, explaining the material we find

in our texts, but not the historical reality that they can be used to reconstruct. Only for the fifth century shall we depart from this rule, both because chronicles are by far the most important evidence for those years, but also because there is in almost every instance no reliable secondary source to which the reader can be safely directed. The introduction to Volume II will consider the consequences of this fact at greater length.

This first volume in the series requires special explanation, as it is very different from the others and has its own reason for existing. It will demonstrate that the chronicle genre has a continuous history over thousands of years and multiple civilizations, introducing those interested in the history of the ancient Near East, Greece, Rome, and the Middle Ages to the genre in all its varieties over time. For too long the study of chronicles has been compartmentalized by standard historical periodization and disciplinary barriers. One result of this is the belief that chronicles are a quintessentially medieval and Christian genre, and one invented in the third or even seventh and eighth centuries with little or no influence from past genres regardless of any similarity of form, style, or approach between earlier and later forms. We would like to think that this first volume will go some way towards breaking down these artificial walls, allowing historians and historiographers to develop a true appreciation of the chronicle genre's long, varied, and continuous history. Part of this breaking down of barriers requires a rethinking of genre and nomenclature in ways that will surprise many readers. A second important goal of this volume is to refute a long-held and influential view that the composition of late Roman chronicles depended upon 'city chronicles' compiled not only by the central Roman 'government' but also by local city governments, who stored them in central archives and published them on stone. And finally, we hope to restore some respect for the genre of chronicle as the fundamental underpinning for all forms of developed historical writing in the West.

A work such as this, covering such a vast historical period, ought by rights to be the culmination of a lifetime's considered work. It is not. On the contrary, it stands at the beginning, not the end, of our study of chronicles. That has consequences: the pages that follow, in this and the later volumes, will no doubt omit much that they ought to have included, and include things that are ill-digested, misunderstood, or just plain wrong. So be it. We must start somewhere. For that reason, we very much hope that this series can form the basis for a great deal more scholarship on the chronicle genre, if only to react against, or build upon, what we have written here.

As always in such works, authors accumulate many debts that cannot be adequately discharged by acknowledgement in the preface. Nevertheless, both authors would

like to thank the following colleagues and friends for correction, advice, and insight, intended or not: Peter Ainsworth, Ed Bloedow, Tim Cornell, J. P. Dessel, Graeme Dunphy (who rescued our current and preferred title from oblivion at the last minute), Geraldine Herbert-Brown, Michael Klaassen, Erik Kooper, Chaim Milikowski, Richard Moll, R. J. van der Spek, Witold Witakowski, and John Yardley.

RWB would like to thank his wife, Louise, for putting up with his physical presence but mental absence for so many years and for keeping everything together in his 'absence'. She has been an excellent sounding board and helpmate for all strange chronicle theories and problems. He would also like to thank Ron D. Moore and David Eick; Mal, Jayne, Wash, Kaylee, and the gang; and the Ottawa Senators for making life bearable when his 'chronische Krankheit' had swallowed just about everything. As has become somewhat traditional by now, he would like to 'thank' his university once again for keeping his department under constant threat of cuts, especially to Latin and Greek, and for making it far more difficult than it should be to teach and undertake research, particularly by cutting travel and research grants and increasing his course load during 2009–10 after he had asked for it to be reduced.

MK, as has so often been the case, owes his greatest thanks to Kathryn Salzer and to his father, both of whom have unfailingly read whatever he writes, whether it is congenial to their tastes or not. He is also grateful to the American Council of Learned Societies, whose Burkhardt fellowship supported the final months of work on this first volume, and to the National Humanities Center (Research Triangle Park, NC), with its superb facilities and hugely amiable colleagues, where that work took place. Finally, he owes new and incalculable thanks to Alan Stern, to Oliver, and most of all to Ellen Stroud.

prid. id. Sept. MMX, ciuitatibus Ottatauensi et Dunelmensi

An unavoidable delay during pre-publication has given us the chance to update and correct a number of aspects of the following text, so that some smaller sections will show signs of revision since 2010, while other longer and more complicated sections will not. We would both like to thank our copy editor, Deborah A. Oosterhouse, for undertaking the almost Herculean task of editing both the original text and the myriad of small changes and corrections that this reworked version involved.

VII kal. Nou. MMXII

## A NOTE ON THE CITATION OF ANCIENT AND MEDIEVAL EDITIONS

**I**t is our hope that this volume will be read by scholars and students from many different disciplines: Near Eastern, Greek, Roman, Late Antique, and Medieval. If that does indeed become the case, texts that will be very familiar to those working in one field may be totally unknown to those in another. For that reason, we have gone out of our way to help readers negotiate the primary sources for times and places far away from their own specialities. In the notes, we have tried wherever possible to indicate the edition used and also any readily available translations, so that readers can follow up our comments and conclusions with access to the full original texts. Where we refer to texts that we do not discuss at any length, we avoid the multiplication of footnotes which a comprehensive citation of editions would require and, for the same reason, we have not cited editions or translations of such well-known classical works as Herodotus, Thucydides, Cicero, Livy, Suetonius, and Tacitus on the assumption that so many editions and translations are widely available that readers will be able to take their pick among them. That said, we have tried to err on the side of caution and completeness, rather than leave readers at sea amongst unfamiliar texts. For works of central importance to our study — mainly late antique texts, but also Byzantine and medieval Latin works that transmit important parts of the ancient corpus — we include before the bibliography a list of the editions we have consulted as a guide for those unfamiliar with these authors and works. Given how central these works are to this and the following volumes, we have also decided to list English (and occasionally French) translations as aids to readers, particularly students, not yet fully proficient in Greek and Latin.

## NOMENCLATURE AND GENRE

Medieval Latin chronicles, so we are always told, developed from the annalistic entries that began to be added in the margins of Easter tables in the seventh and eighth centuries. In 1826 Georg Pertz summed up this idea in the preface to the first volume of the *Scriptores* series of the new *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*: the newly popular Easter cycles of Dionysius Exiguus in the sixth century, and of Bede in the eighth, spread throughout the churches and monasteries of western Europe, and the blank spaces left in their margins prompted men with dull minds (*'tardioris ingenii'*) to add brief historical notes. The practice began in Britain, and followed in Gaul and Germany, at the end of the seventh and especially in the eighth centuries.<sup>1</sup> The Kentish and Northumbrian chronicles to which Pertz was referring display historical entries from the early

<sup>1</sup> MGH SS, 1: 1–2. The earliest such chronicles that Pertz had in mind were the *Annales Iuuauenses*, now treated to a lengthy study by Story 2005. The Kentish chronicle of the *Iuuauenses* covers *c.* 620 to 690 and the Northumbrian chronicle covers 651 to 671 and 704. It must be pointed out that although Pertz uses the term *'annales'* in his preface, entitles almost every single text in his first volume *'annales'* (and these are *all* modern, not medieval, titles), and explicitly divides all his texts into *'annals'*, *'chronicles'*, and *'histories'* in later volumes, it is very difficult to work out exactly how he defined these terms: *annales* seems to include all annalistic works, no matter what the starting date, the number of authors or continuators, the topical focus of the work, or the length of its entries, while *chronica* includes texts identical to those he calls *'annales'*, narrative works in the mode of the epitomes of Isidore and Bede, regnal list compendia, and hagiographic *gesta*. Obviously there are some fundamental problems with definitions at play here. These problems of nomenclature will occupy us in most of this chapter, and, as the reader will see, we make no distinction between *'chronicles'* and *'annals'* — indeed, we suggest that the latter term should be abandoned as unnecessary. For that reason, we simply use the word *'chronicles'* in our discussion here in spite of Pertz's original terminology.

seventh century and continental examples appear at the beginning of the eighth. Inference from this chronology is ostensibly confirmed by the arrangement of the various MGH *Scriptores* volumes, which seem to show a progression from brief annalistic notes in Easter tables, to stand-alone collections of ‘annals’, to universal chronicles, to lengthy developed narratives (that is, the *Scriptores* seems to show an evolution from ‘*annales*’ to ‘*chronica*’ to ‘*historiae*’). Dates and nineteenth-century editorial decisions and titles thus conspire to suggest an obvious chronological development from one form to another. The foundation for the strictly medieval interpretation of the origins of chronicles was thus laid nearly two hundred years ago.<sup>2</sup>

This interpretation of how the chronicle genre was invented makes perfect sense when viewed within the confines of the MGH *Scriptores* volumes, and perhaps because medievalists used these volumes for so many decades as the major if not only source for Latin chronicle texts, Pertz’s hypothesis came to be perceived as reality and his titles as contemporary with the texts themselves. Nevertheless, attentive readers might have noted the many sources cited in the margins of the longer chronicles published in some of the later *Scriptores* volumes: there, listed for all to see, were references to a large number of late antique chronicles written between the fourth and eighth centuries. Thereafter, the three *Chronica minora* volumes which Theodor Mommsen published in the MGH *Auctores antiquissimi* series between 1892 and 1898 should have at last revealed the fundamental weakness of the Easter-table theory: the *Chronica minora* printed all but one of the chronicles that were cited in the margins of the *Scriptores* series, all dating from between 433 and 725. Along with these well-known chronicles, which were less developed than many of what Pertz called ‘annals’, were other texts that were clearly identical in form to the very earliest annals in MGH SS, 1, annotated Easter tables among them. Finally, in 1913 and 1923, came the definitive publications of the one chronicle missing from Mommsen’s corpus, Jerome’s translation of Eusebius of Caesarea’s *Chronici canones* of 381, which had actually been in print since 1475 and available in an adequate modern edition since 1866. These late ancient

<sup>2</sup> In English this view was first widely disseminated by Reginald Lane Poole (1926: 5, 9–28, 33–34), at whose eccentric ideas one can only marvel. To take a few of many examples: consuls, regnal years, and indictions were not ‘well adapted for the construction of Chronicles’; chronicles are impossible without an ‘Era’; the only valid Era is ‘The Year of the Incarnation’, which derives from Easter tables; this Era ‘was beyond all question an English discovery’ (i.e. by Bede); and the lack of an Era before Bede ‘is significant of the decay of literature in the sixth century and onwards, and helps to explain the obscurity of writers of that period’.



chronicles were self-evidently the predecessors of and inspiration for medieval chronicles, of which they were also (at least to begin with) the main sources. Yet there remained a problem: how could chronicles have begun in the seventh century with Easter tables when fully developed chronicles were extant from the late fourth to the early eighth centuries?

Not until 1947 did a scholar of sufficient stature and broad enough audience attempt to modify this widely accepted theory of chronicle origins. Like nearly all medievalists, Charles W. Jones accepted the theory that medieval chronicles derived from Easter tables. But, having been educated in a post-*Chronica minora* world, he also knew that chronicles had existed earlier, between the third and sixth centuries. Likewise thanks to Mommsen, he knew that Easter-table chronicles (what medievalists called ‘annals’) had been composed at the beginning of the sixth century in southern Italy, which is to say more than one hundred years before the ‘first’ Easter-table chronicles in Kent and Northumbria. Faced with a contradiction between long-standing hypothesis and the evidence, and unwilling to abandon either, Jones came up with an ingenious solution to his problem: Easter tables and *computus* (i.e. the means of calculating the date of Easter) lay behind not just the medieval chronicles of the seventh century and later, but behind all earlier chronicles as well, in a tradition that had begun with Julius Africanus in 221.<sup>3</sup> In other words, for Jones Easter tables did indeed give rise to chronicles, but not in the seventh century. As examples of chroniclers influenced by Easter tables he explicitly named Africanus, Hippolytus, Eusebius, Jerome, Prosper, Hydatius, Marcellinus, Cassiodorus, Victor, Isidore, and Bede. Indeed Jones went so far as to claim that the tradition of such chronicles reached back to the early Hebrews, who had Pass-over table chronicles that were used as sources by the writers of the Old Testament.<sup>4</sup> Jones’s immense *auctoritas* thus strengthened the old hypothesis that the origin of medieval chronicles lay in Easter tables, and his views, or variants of them, came to be canonized in the standard handbooks of Wattenbach-Levison-Löwe, McCormick, and the *Lexikon des Mittelalters*, among many others.<sup>5</sup>

The fact is, however, that chronicles have a long history in the non-Christian classical world, and indeed in the pre-classical world, so that Easter tables can have

<sup>3</sup> This ubiquitous ‘fact’ about chronicles’ developing from Africanus owes nothing to modern scholarship but is simply parroted from the preface of Isidore’s so-called *Chronica* of 615. As we shall see in Chapters 2 and 3, Isidore’s statement is wrong.

<sup>4</sup> See Jones 1943: 114–22 and Jones 1947: 7–11, esp. pp. 9–10.

<sup>5</sup> See Wattenbach and others 1952–90: I, 50–60; McCormick 1975: 11–21; and *LMA*, I, 657–58, s.v. ‘Annalen’ (Jaeschke).

had no part in the origin or early development of the genre. And even though the late antique chroniclers listed by Jones as forerunners of medieval chroniclers were Christians, not one of their chronicles had anything whatsoever to do with Easter tables. Jones's claims are completely false. It should have been apparent that Jones had taken a series of erroneous steps from the reasonable observation that seventh- and eighth-century Easter-table chronicles appear to be the earliest surviving form of medieval chronicle to the illogical supposition that, because the origin of medieval chronicles lies in Easter tables, all earlier chronicles (which he dated no earlier than the third century) must have had an origin in Easter tables as well.<sup>6</sup>

But the reality is that Jones's errors mattered little. The part of his hypothesis that accepted the connection between late antique Christian chronicles and early medieval chronicles was ignored by many medievalists, seemingly because it denied the dogma of the genre's medieval origins. Nevertheless, Jones had brought pre-medieval chronicles into the equation and so later commentators had to deal with them. Like many others, Michael McCormick did not accept Jones's idea of the genre's continuity by way of Easter tables. Although he admitted the obvious similarities between late antique and medieval chronicles, and even the existence of consularia and annotated Easter tables in the late Roman Empire, he denied any connection between the earlier late antique tradition and the later medieval one. The break between the two forms was absolute.<sup>7</sup> Others took a different tack and solved the contradiction Jones presented through terminological and generic differentiation: 'chronicles' may indeed have existed from the time of Africanus, Eusebius, and Jerome (whether there was an unbroken tradition or not), but 'annals', that is, annotated Easter tables and the chronological works that descended from them, were indeed an invention of the seventh and eighth centuries.<sup>8</sup> These two general approaches of denial and fundamental chronological disjunction remain dominant, if not quite universal, to this day.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>6</sup> In fact, we can now show that the seventh- and eighth-century origin of the medieval chronicle genre is also incorrect, as recent research demonstrates that Irish chronicles originated in the sixth century. See Chapter 6, below.

<sup>7</sup> McCormick 1975: 14.

<sup>8</sup> In fact, it has been said that 'Annalen sind die eigenwüchsigste Form mittelalterlicher Geschichtsschreibung' (Grundmann 1965: 25). See *LMA*, I, 657–58, s.v. 'Annalen' (Jaeschke) and II, 1955–60, 1965, s.v. 'Chronik' (Wirth, Schnith, and Manselli). This approach can be found elsewhere as well, e.g. Dunphy 2004: 201–09. See also 'Chapter 1, note 32' in the Appendices to the Footnotes, pp. 358–59 below.

<sup>9</sup> See also Dumville 2002: 4–7. Croke 2001a: 150 n. 23 lists a number of others who cling to the dogma of the genre's medieval origins, to which one can add Garmonsway 1953: xviii–xxi, Hay

As we shall see below, the modern belief in the medieval origins of the chronicle genre suffers from two basic errors. First, and even if only subconsciously, it relies on the idea of a 'dark age' between the ancient world and the Middle Ages, an interpretation that was universally accepted when the hypothesis of the chronicle's medieval origins first originated, but that has been discarded in our re-evaluation of what we now call 'late antiquity'. The continued acceptance of a break or gap between the ancient and medieval worlds allows scholars to ignore or dismiss every early example of a chronicle and posit a 'new beginning' in the seventh and eighth centuries. Furthermore, research since the 1970s has demonstrated that the medieval Irish chronicle tradition actually arose in the sixth century (see Chapter 6), another blow to the idea of the chronicle genre's medieval origins, at least in Ireland, though no one can deny the later influence of the Irish beyond their own borders.<sup>10</sup> The second major error is to put hypothesis and theory ahead of the evidence. Scholars are now so burdened by the authority of tralatitious vocabularies, and by the hypotheses associated with them, that they find themselves unable to see the force of the evidence itself.

1977: 38–49, Wilcox 1987: 133–36, Reuter 1992: 1, and Dunphy 2004: 205. Newton 1972: 43–60 is an intelligent but uninfluential early attempt to arrest the dissemination of these ideas. McGuire 1967 is particularly interesting: at one level, it reproduces the standard account of the generic difference between annals and chronicle; the importance of the *Chronograph of 354* and Anglo-Saxon Easter tables in the development of annals; the idea that the 'recording [of] contemporary historical events on [...] calendars [...] is the foundation of all medieval annals'; and that chronicles must be lengthy texts, so that Sulpicius Severus's *Chronica*, Augustine's *De ciuitate dei*, Orosius's *Historiae contra paganos*, and book one of Gregory of Tours's *Historiae* are all considered chronicles. Yet alongside this tralatitious and medieval-centred account, he provides abundant contradictory evidence for the existence of Assyrian, Babylonian, Hellenistic, Roman, Byzantine, late Roman, and Syriac chronicles and annals, prefatory evidence that seems to have had no influence on the general presentation or conclusions of the main text. More important for medievalists, though sadly no more influential, is Dumville 2002. On the late Roman side there is the important Croke 1983a, the starting point for the present volume, and, indirectly, Mosshammer 1979. The more recent article in *DNP*, II, 1168–72 (Rüpke, Glassner, Rist), although disjointed and somewhat weak in its details, is a good attempt to place all chronicles from Near Eastern to Byzantine into a similar historiographical continuum. K.-U. Jaeschke in *LMA*, I, 658 tries the same thing for 'annals' by quite rightly bringing late Roman consularia, the chronicle of Cassiodorus, and even Assyrian *limmu* lists into play (on which, see Chapter 2 below), but goes off track with the *Annales maximi* and Tacitus (see note 35 below) and fails to make the obvious connection between late Roman precedent and medieval continuation.

<sup>10</sup> R. Collins (1998: 3–4) has suggested that the boom of chronicle writing in Germany may have begun in the 730s and 740s as a result of influence from Irish chronicles.

There is a further consequence to the belief in the medieval origins of chronicles, inasmuch as it has also contributed to the generally low estimation of their value as a genre. Because classical or 'classicizing' history, as it is usually called — Herodotus and Thucydides in Greek, Livy and Tacitus in Latin, for instance — has since the Renaissance been held up as the ideal form of writing about the past, a genre like the chronicle that differs so obviously from it can only be regarded as second- or third-rate; when combined with the generalized depreciation of things Christian and medieval ('Gothic') in comparison to things ancient, customary since the Renaissance and still implicit in much modern scholarship, the inferiority of the chronicle as a way of conceptualizing and reporting past events is simply assumed without a second thought. Even those who edit or study chronicles can echo Pertz's view of them as the obvious product of enfeebled Christian minds.<sup>11</sup>

Yet despite the claims of the genre's medieval origin, and despite the pervasively low estimate of the form, chronicles were in fact every bit as much a part of ancient historiography as was classicizing history and the works of Thucydides and Tacitus. Throughout classical and post-classical antiquity, chronicles and classicizing histories stood side-by-side. Their relationship was not hierarchical; they were simply different ways of writing about the past. Each served a different purpose, and neither could do the work of the other given the technological limitations of ancient writing media. This is really of fundamental importance for understanding chronicles, and Hayden White is one of the few modern scholars to have grasped this fact:

In what follows I treat the annals and chronicle forms of historical representation, not as the imperfect histories they are conventionally conceived to be, but rather as particular products of possible conceptions of historical reality, conceptions that are alternatives to, rather than failed anticipations of, the fully realized historical discourse that the modern history form is supposed to embody.

Does the world really present itself to perception in the form of well-made stories, with central subjects, proper beginnings, middles, and ends, and a coherence that permits us to see 'the end' in every beginning[, which are important prerequisites for 'proper' history]? Or does it present itself more in the forms that the annals and chronicle suggest, either as mere sequence without beginning or end or as sequences of beginnings that only terminate and never conclude? [...] If it were only a matter of realism in representation, one could make a pretty good case for both the annals and chronicle forms as paradigms of ways that reality offers itself to perception. (White 1987: 5–6, 24–25)

<sup>11</sup> White 1987: 1–25 tackles this problem well, particularly pp. 4–6, 15, 17, 18, 21, and 24–25, where he shows that chronicles and annals are most often defined through their 'failure' to achieve the requirements of 'proper history'. Further ancient and modern examples of these negative attitudes can be found in 'Chapter 1, note 11' in the Appendices to the Footnotes, pp. 357–58 below.

As we shall see, M. Tullius Cicero, the great Roman statesman, philosopher, orator, and writer, knew exactly what constituted 'proper' history — in fact, a large part of the modern conception of historical writing derives from his writings — yet he took great pleasure in reading and using the chronicle composed by his friend Atticus. If one of Rome's greatest minds could delight in a chronicle, there is no reason why we cannot as well. It simply requires an understanding and acknowledgement of what a chronicle is in itself and not how it stands in relation to something else.

Part of the purpose of this volume is to demonstrate that late antique and medieval chronicles, of which so many examples are extant, were not an invention of Christian late antiquity or the Middle Ages at all, but rather the natural outgrowth of a millennium-old Mediterranean tradition of writing history. It is still possible to reconstruct this very ancient heritage, but to do so we must discard our belief in the chronicle's medieval origin and our consequent prejudices against the genre.

As the first part of this book will show, the direct ancestor of the late antique and medieval chronicle took shape in Greece in the third century BC, if not before. If one takes a wider view, however, it is clear that this Hellenistic Greek tradition developed out of a much older historiographical tradition, common to many Mediterranean cultures and reaching back to the third millennium BC. Works that closely resemble Hellenistic, Roman, late antique, and medieval chronicles were written in Egyptian, Babylonian, Assyrian, and other Near Eastern contexts. In the same way that modern scholarship has increasingly demonstrated the close economic and cultural connections between the Greek Aegean, the Nile valley, the Levant, and Mesopotamia, so we should now acknowledge the roots of the Graeco-Roman chronicle in the ambit of the greater Near East.

Until now, this story has not been told. It is true that a few pioneering scholars have laid out the importance of Greek chronography and Olympiad chronicles for the late antique chronographic work of Eusebius, which was fundamental to all that followed thereafter.<sup>12</sup> But no one has ever attempted to present the panorama

<sup>12</sup> McGuire 1967: 551–52 (who also mentions Assyrian and Babylonian chronicles); Mosshammer 1979; and especially Croke 1983a. Although it seems to have been pretty much forgotten, Curt Wachsmuth devoted 76 out of 704 pages, almost 11 per cent, of his *Einleitung in das Studium der alten Geschichte* to 'Weltchroniken', presenting a wide-ranging survey of pagan and Christian chronicles from Eratosthenes to Phlegon, Nepos to the continuators of Jerome and Isidore in the West, and Africanus down the *Chronicon Paschale*, Nicephorus, George the Monk, Cedrenus, and the witnesses to Symeon the Logothete in the East (Wachsmuth 1895). For some reason chronicles are never given such a prominent position in modern studies of the historiography of the ancient world, and few students (or indeed scholars) today are aware of them or their importance. The *OCD*, for instance, does not have an entry for 'chronicle' and its entries for Greek, Hellenistic, and

of the Western chronographic tradition from its earliest known roots in Assyria and Babylonia, through the Greek Olympiad chronicle and Hellenistic and Christian apologetic chronography, to Jerome and the late antique chronicles, and on into the early Middle Ages as far as Sigebert in the twelfth century. This volume sets out to tell that story. Later volumes in the series will be concerned with the analysis of the Latin chronicle tradition of late antiquity, on which so much of our knowledge about the fall of the western Roman Empire rests. Volume II will present and analyse the surviving chronicle texts of the republic and empire as well, so that later Latin traditions can be viewed in their proper historiographical context. Since the groundbreaking scholarship of the later nineteenth century, no systematic analysis of that late antique tradition has been undertaken on a scale similar to that of the present work, and the results are surprising.

The systematic analysis which we present in this and the following volumes demonstrates that what we know about the last centuries of the Roman Empire rests on less secure foundations than anyone has previously believed. Events and chronologies that have seemed to be attested by multiple independent sources are not thus attested. That means that entire tranches of our modern narratives have been reconstructed on false assumptions about what the sources actually say. In subsequent volumes, we shall provide translations of Latin chronicle traditions from the first century BC down to the sixth AD, newly edited texts where necessary, detailed analyses of the multifaceted internal relationships among chronicles, and a historical commentary on the late antique material in each text. This is a large undertaking, and we have hardly begun to recognize the problems that our new approach creates. All the same, we hope that these volumes will provide a new basis for a serious re-evaluation of the chronicle genre throughout Western history, and of the history and historiography of late antiquity in particular. Before turning to exposition and analysis, however, we must first offer definitions and defences of our terminology and approach to genre.

### *Genre 1: Fasti and Annals*

Latin writers notoriously fail to distinguish their vocabulary for different sorts of historical works in any meaningful way.<sup>13</sup> Greek literature theoretically provides

Roman historiography make but a single reference to 'local chronicles' in passing (p. 715) and say nothing about the genre or its authors, like Eratosthenes or Apollodorus (pp. 714–17).

<sup>13</sup> See Croke 2001b: 291–304 and Dumville 2002: 1–4, and especially Verbrughe 1989 for the terms 'annals' and 'annalist'.

greater guidance to its own generic vocabulary, but Greek authors did not always trouble to observe their own distinctions in practice and over time these distinctions changed. Modern scholars have thus had to develop a specialized vocabulary for historical writing, based upon Greek and Latin terms, but giving it greater precision than the ancients ever did themselves. Unfortunately, this more precise modern vocabulary is very far from uniform. Different scholars can quite happily use apparently specialized words like 'annals', 'consularia', 'chronicle', and even 'fasti' to refer to exactly the same work, or a single word like 'annals' to describe utterly different types of works. In undertaking a study on the present scale, we have found it absolutely essential to deploy a uniform vocabulary for the differing types of ancient historical writing. The very fact of deploying this vocabulary, however, presupposes particular ideas about genre, and it is only fair that we spell these out for the reader.

First of all, like most Classicists and ancient historians, we believe in genre as something observable in, and usually consciously chosen by, ancient authors, and hence a useful tool of analysis. The discomfort of some medievalists and modern literary critics with the whole idea of genre seems to us impossible to transpose to an ancient context.<sup>14</sup> The distinctions we draw below are real distinctions, in that they describe recognizable generic differences among types of historical writing, differences that were recognized by their writers, even though they had no consistent terminology for what they were doing. They have as much warrant in their original Latin as any other modern usages, but it is worth stressing that the Latin, and to a lesser extent the Greek, historical vocabularies do not draw distinctions with anything like the strictness we employ here. Our terminology, then, is both a heuristic device for analysis and, even more important, a means by which the reader can be entirely certain about the type of document or work we are discussing at any given point. We must emphasize that we are not in any way claiming that anyone in antiquity used these terms in this way. The terminology is of contemporary or near-contemporary usage, but the precision of the definitions and their application to specific works is wholly modern.<sup>15</sup>

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, we should note that in setting out the terminology that we shall employ in these volumes, we are not insisting that others

<sup>14</sup> Deliyannis 2003: 1–13.

<sup>15</sup> Something similar is necessary for the poetry of late antiquity as well, for which see Roberts 1989: 6: 'In the absence of an explicit contemporary account of the poetics of late antiquity, these norms must be derived from a study of the texts themselves and of the implied expectations they have of the reader.'

employ it or even agree with it. However, we do believe that there needs to be a more 'ecumenical' vocabulary that can be used with some degree of comfort and accuracy by all those who study chronicles, from those of ancient Assyria to those of the humanists in early modern Europe. That such a thing could happen is no doubt unlikely, given the long scholarly traditions behind current usage in various disciplines and subdisciplines. We nevertheless hope that those who use this sort of historiographical terminology in future will consider our definitions, and our justifications for them, and that, if they choose to disagree, they provide a similar explanation and defence of their alternative definition and then employ that alternative consistently. Awareness of the problem, and of the need for a consistency of usage, is in our opinion the most important point, not the actual terms employed. To this end we have appended a short postscript to this chapter that briefly sets forth our terminology for quick reference. The rest of this chapter is devoted to the definition of and distinctions among these terms: first 'calendar', 'fasti', 'consularia', and 'annals'; then 'chronicle' and 'history'; and finally 'chronicle' and 'consularia'.

### Calendars, Fasti, and Consularia

The first genre we distinguish is 'fasti'. The word *fasti* itself properly denotes calendars which recorded the months, days in the month, important religious festivals, and the days on which it was legal to conduct business. *Fastus* is an adjective derived from the Latin noun *fas*, which denotes that which is right or permissible within divine law. As an adjective, *fastus* was applied to days (*dies*) when business could be conducted lawfully, hence *dies fasti* (and, by contrast, *dies nefasti*). The term *fasti* itself then came by extension to be applied to a calendar that listed these *fasti* and *nefasti* days, organized month by month, in which sense Ovid used it as the title of his greatest poem, the *Fasti* (*The Calendar*). Such calendars established and governed the civic and religious rhythms of the population of Rome.<sup>16</sup> By the end of the republic, however, 'fasti' had come to refer not just to the annual month-and-day calendar, but also to composite lists of years gone by, which is to say lists of the two consuls who gave their names to the year in which they held their magistracy. The Romans had no widely accepted means of numbering each year, so the only way to identify any given past year was by the names of its chief

<sup>16</sup> The most complete and detailed study of these Roman calendars is Rüpke 1995b. For the republican calendar, see Michels 1967.



magistrates, the consuls.<sup>17</sup> Consular lists that identified the years of the recent past were vital for anyone who needed to keep track of the passage of years: bureaucrats, civil servants, businessmen, administrators, military officials, and lawyers. Such lists were easily copied onto papyrus, vellum, or wax tablets in a way that made them easy to access and use. In time, writers of an antiquarian or historical bent might add historical notices to various years in such fasti, associating past events with the eponymous year in which they occurred. Modern scholars often use the term ‘fasti’ to describe these amplified or annotated consular lists, as well as the bare lists themselves, a practice that derives from Mommsen’s *Chronica minora* editions, which use ‘fasti’ and ‘consularia’ interchangeably to describe a consular list with brief and annalistic historical notes. Sometimes such lists are called ‘annals’ or ‘consular annals’ in the modern literature, following the medievalist usage of the term, which will be discussed below. Ancient authors use neither ‘fasti’ nor ‘annals’ to describe annotated consular lists, and there are, in fact, only three certain references to such documents in the whole corpus of ancient literature. All three date to the sixth century AD, where they are called, respectively, *consularia* (Gregory of Tours, *Historiae*, 2. 9; pp. 57–58), *annorum series* (Cassiodorus, *Chronica*, 1365), and *consulum series* (Jordanes, *Romana*, 388).<sup>18</sup>

Despite these few imprecise references to what are clearly annotated consular lists, the ancient vocabulary as a whole draws no firm distinctions among the three generically distinct sorts of work that we have outlined: day-and-month calendars, consular lists, and annotated consular lists.<sup>19</sup> Nevertheless, these distinctions are real and, as we shall see, Latin writers accepted the differing structural and stylistic constraints of each of these separate genres, despite their having no fixed vocabulary for distinguishing among them. Similarly, modern scholars who are not aware of these differences can confuse them when discussing or analysing ancient texts.<sup>20</sup> We therefore feel justified in maintaining a sharp distinction in our own modern

<sup>17</sup> This system will be explained in detail in Chapter 4.

<sup>18</sup> Jordanes distinguishes ‘consulum series’ from ‘annales’, which he uses to mean histories in a general sense: see Verbrugghe 1989.

<sup>19</sup> See Feeney 2007: 167–68.

<sup>20</sup> For instance, Fox 2007: 259 translates Cicero, *Ep. ad familiares*, 5. 12. 5, ‘Etenim ordo ipse annalium mediocriter nos retinet quasi enumeratione fastorum’ (‘Indeed, the simple listing of events year by year isn’t really any more interesting than reciting a list of consuls’), on which see Appendix 2, as ‘Indeed the list of the annals hardly holds our attention, just like the records on the state calendar’. This completely misses the point of Cicero’s comment. Others are aware of the differences: Wiseman 1979: 13–14, 18.

vocabulary, not only for heuristic purposes, so that readers will know immediately from the word we use what type of text we are referring to, but because doing so reflects generic distinctions that the ancients observed in practice, though not in nomenclature. In all that follows, therefore, day-and-month calendars, in the earliest and Ovidian sense of the Latin word ‘fasti’, are simply ‘calendars’, which is a straight translation since the modern analogy is very close; unadorned lists of consuls are ‘fasti’ or ‘consular fasti’, following Roman practice; and lists of consuls with very short historical entries appended are ‘consularia’, following the usage of Gregory of Tours and subsequently Frick and Mommsen in their volumes of 1892, each independently named *Chronica minora*.<sup>21</sup>

## Annals

We must now explain why we do not employ the term ‘annals’ to describe consularia, which are in most ways exactly analogous to the texts that modern medievalists call ‘annals’ and which have indeed been called ‘annals’ by other modern scholars.<sup>22</sup> In fact, we need to explain why we do not use the word to describe any form of text, medieval or otherwise.

Medievalists, as noted above, have devised their definitions of ‘annals’ and ‘chronicle’ in isolation from the earlier history of chronicles and have thus been fundamentally influenced by the use of the term ‘chronicle’ in the later medieval period: by then, lengthy and fully developed works, like that of Froissart, which we classicists would call ‘histories’, were called ‘chronicles’. Although their definitions are quite fluid and there is little agreement on the details within any group of scholarly works, in general medievalists draw a distinction between annals and chronicles as follows: annals are anonymous lists of years (always years AD) with very brief and often very infrequent paratactic annotations, compiled contemporaneously by many hands in a ‘tabular’ format, with a generally local or monastic focus; chronicles are a more developed and sophisticated genre, longer, more detailed, with more literary annalistic narratives, more ‘universal’ in character and with more of

<sup>21</sup> E.g., the document called the *Consularia Ravennatiae* by Frick and the *Annales/Fasti Vindobonenses* by Mommsen, Mommsen’s *Consularia Constantinopolitana*, and his *Consularia Italica*, which had previously been called the *Ravennater Annalen/Annales Ravennatenses* by Holder-Egger 1876.

<sup>22</sup> E.g. Holder-Egger 1876, Bischoff and Koehler 1939, and Croke 2001b. The exactness of the formal analogy is yet another argument against the supposed medieval origin of ‘annals’.

a central focus or subject, and composed by a single author regardless of structure or length.<sup>23</sup> Furthermore, medievalists tend to believe that these genres, though superficially similar, had quite independent origins. That is, chronicles can be traced back to the third-century Christian chronicle of Julius Africanus, while annals developed from Easter tables, as we discussed at the beginning of this chapter. Alongside these ‘annals’ and ‘chronicles’, medievalists and early modernists also recognize a still more developed and refined genre of ‘history’, but the definition of that term would involve us further in controversies beyond our present purview.

The terminological and historiographical problem lies in the fact that the Middle Ages to all intents and purposes inherited only one major type of historical writing from late antiquity: the chronicle. Large-scale narrative history was lost as a normal genre from the time of Gregory of Tours and the author of the ‘Fredegar chronicle’.<sup>24</sup> Thus ‘chronicle’ was used to describe any kind of historical writing, no matter what the style or form. When more developed and varied forms of historical writing, some of them as elaborate as any classical or Renaissance history, evolved out of plain chronicles, they were called chronicles, as they still are.

But from the twelfth century at least, contemporary historians had themselves begun to realize the difference between developed history and plain chronicle, and over the following centuries many attempted to define the differences between the two, even though ‘chronicle’ was still the standard way of naming a factual work

<sup>23</sup> See, in general, McGuire 1967: 551, White 1987: 4–25, Croke 2001b: 294 with nn. 10 and 11, Dumville 2002: 1–8, Dunphy 2004: 201–11, Coleman 2007: 3–7, and particularly Dunphy 2010a and 2010b (written with knowledge of a final draft of this volume). Note especially the extremes in the definition of the chronicle mentioned by Dumville, who says that some modern scholarship ‘allows almost any narrative text dealing with supposedly historical persons and events to be called a chronicle’ and quotes one medievalist as defining chronicles as ‘general, serious historical writing’ (2002: 1). Dunphy (2010a: 282) says, “‘chronicles’ has broadened almost to a synonym for “historical writing””. With surprising optimism, Burrow declares, ‘the categories are pretty clear [...]: annals are disconnected, chronicles are episodic, history is ideally continuous’ (2009: 230–31). For medieval ‘annals’ and chronicles, see also *LMA*, I, 657–61, s.v. ‘Annalen’ (Jaeschke) and II, 1954–2028, s.v. ‘Chronik’ (Wirth, Schnith, and Manselli). A very early explication in English of the difference between ‘annals’ and chronicles (amidst a discussion of the differences between chronicles and history) can be found in Stubbs 1867: xii and lvi, in his well-known introduction to the chronicle of Benedict of Peterborough.

<sup>24</sup> We here set to one side Bede’s *Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum* of 731 and Einhard’s *Vita Karoli Magni imperatoris*, almost exactly one hundred years later, since they are in a real sense aberrations without immediate precedent or influence (McGuire 1967: 552: they ‘must be regarded as rare and isolated phenomena’).

that described the past.<sup>25</sup> So strong was this tradition of nomenclature that when Froissart, for instance, was writing his enormous history of the years 1322 to 1400 — which fills fifteen fat volumes in the nineteenth-century Belgian edition of Kervyn de Lettenhove and would thus never be thought of as a chronicle in any period but the later Middle Ages — in internal references in his first edition he still usually called his work a ‘chronique’, as well as ‘histoire’, and used verbs like ‘croniquer’ and ‘cronisier’ simply to mean ‘to write (a history)’, even with ‘histoire’ as the direct object.<sup>26</sup> He could also use the two verbs together, ‘cronisier et historier’, simply to describe historical writing.<sup>27</sup> This sort of interchangeability of vocabulary was not unusual, even when writers tried hard to make distinctions for themselves.<sup>28</sup> But in spite of this interchangeability, when Froissart thought strictly in terms of genre, he knew exactly what was history and what was chronicle, and made it plain that he was writing history.<sup>29</sup>

It is only because we possess a rich, developed corpus of what many late medieval authors did indeed call ‘chronicles’ that modern scholars felt the need to find a different word with which to distinguish the less-developed chronological works of the Middle Ages, and particularly of the early Middle Ages. Instead of following

<sup>25</sup> This is true even in the Byzantine East. Michael Glycas in the twelfth century and Theodorus Scutariotes in the thirteenth make very sharp distinctions in their prefaces between historians and chroniclers, to the detriment of the former (see R. Scott 1990: 48). Both considered their own works chronicles, though we would call them epitome histories (see below). The twelfth-century author Constantine Manasses (on whom see Hunger 1978: I, 253–54) also seems to distinguish between historians and chronographers (5. 21: ‘πολλοὶ ἱστορήσαντες καὶ χρονογραφῆσαντες’). But this may simply be tautologous: see below on Froissart’s usage of similar terms.

<sup>26</sup> On the other hand, in the Amiens manuscript (Bibliothèque municipale, 486), which represents a second edition of book one from about 1378, Froissart never refers to his work as a chronicle, only as a ‘livre’ or ‘(h)istoire’: Diller 1991: xxxi.

<sup>27</sup> See Kervyn de Lettenhove 1867–77: XIX, 114 and 255, where ‘croniquer’ and ‘cronisier’ are defined as ‘rédiger (un récit historique)’ and ‘historier’ is said to be ‘synonyme de *croniquer*’.

<sup>28</sup> Guenée 1973: 1002–04.

<sup>29</sup> ‘Se je disoie: “Ainsi et ainsi advint en ce temps”, sans ouvrir, ne declairer la matière qui fut grande, grosse et horrible et bien taillée pour en venir ung grant inconvéniens, ce seroit cronique et non pas histoire’ (‘If I were to say, “In such and such a way it came about at that time”, without revealing and explaining the matter which was important and weighty and dreadful and fashioned to end in a great misfortune, that would be a chronicle and not a history’; *Chroniques*, 3. 159 (Kervyn de Lettenhove 1867–77: XII, 153 (trans. by Louise Stephens)): the standard Société de l’Histoire de France edition (Mirot and Mirot 1957: 222) reports a false reading — ‘cronique non pas histoire’ — that was taken over from the Vérard edition of c. 1498). Our thanks to Graeme Dunphy for pointing this out to us. See also Guenée 1973: 1007–08 and Ainsworth 1990: 46–49.

the standard distinction between 'history' and 'chronicle' that had already developed between the twelfth and sixteenth centuries, they deployed a new name, 'annals', one whose roots were not medieval, but rather classical. Before *c.* 1200, *annales* was rarely used and meant nothing more than 'history' in a general sense, which was a continuation of its Roman usage. But in the late medieval and humanist period, *annales* was used as a simple synonym for 'chronicle', in contradistinction to 'history'. (On the use and meaning of the word 'annales' in the medieval period, see Appendix 2.) Thus when modern scholars used 'annals' to describe simple early medieval chronographic works, they were using an authentically old lexeme, but with a crucial difference, always missed by medievalists today: although the word may be ancient and medieval, its modern connotation is a completely modern invention.

The whole vocabulary deployed by modern medievalists is, it seems to us, problematical on three levels. First, the retrojection of late definitions (in this case, of 'chronicle') onto earlier genres, even if both happened to bear the same name among contemporaries, reverses normal historical method and risks importing later assumptions into a context in which they do not apply. Second, while ignoring what was actually happening in the Middle Ages and what contemporary historians were actually writing and thinking about genre, it imports a classical word ('annals') that was rarely if ever used by those historians, who had no concept of the sort of text to which the word had once applied. And third, it assumes a correspondence between genre and lexeme (or generic nomenclature) that either did not exist ('annals') or existed in a far less strict correspondence than believed ('chronicle'). The distorting possibilities of the first and second objections should be clear to all. Those of the third may be particularly clear to the ancient historian. Even after a very brief exposure to the historico-chronological genres of antiquity, the ancient historian cannot help but realize that ancient Greeks and Romans recognized genres that they adhered to quite strictly, violating their boundaries only purposefully and signalling the fact of so doing. Likewise, a seemingly technical vocabulary for historico-chronological genres is visible in the sources. Despite that fact, however, the observable technical vocabulary for genre was never consistently applied to the genres whose rules authors actually observed: not in Greek (where the problem of such definitions was at least discussed) and still less in Latin (where it was not).

The problem here is obvious: modern medievalists, schooled in the modern use of these words, simply assume that the definitions as well as the words are medieval. They therefore apply these meanings when they find these words in the literature, both medieval and modern, but the problems are particularly acute in the case of medieval literature. Now we can, of course, define ancient historico-chronological

genres and the characteristics that were observed in their composition in any way we choose, giving those genres names drawn from the ancient Greek and Latin vocabulary of genre. But having done that, we cannot legitimately pretend that any medieval technical terminology corresponds precisely to the medieval generic distinctions that were observed in practice, that any medieval author or thinker applied the generic vocabulary as strictly as we would need for it to serve as a modern heuristic tool, or that any medieval writer or thinker even employed those terms with those meanings at all. Ultimately, this represents a failure in the modern study of medieval historiography: no one has been careful enough to separate the modern from the authentically medieval, so that the distinction has blurred to the point that the modern can be believed to be medieval.

It seems very likely to us that something similar lies behind many of the disputes amongst medievalists over what does or does not constitute a 'chronicle'. We suspect that, just as in antiquity, medieval sources provide the warrant for a wide vocabulary describing historico-chronological writings, and that, just as in antiquity, a definite set of more or less widely observed generic conventions existed, but that, just as in antiquity, no correspondence between the seemingly technical vocabulary of genre and the observable genres holds good at a level strict enough to satisfy modern analytical needs. Deploying authentically medieval terminology to describe observable medieval generic differences may, in consequence, have led to an impasse that either excludes the wrong things or includes too many under a single generic title ('chronicle'). The importation of essentially pre-medieval terminology, the attachment to it of modern definitions, and its application in opposition to what medieval writers actually thought and wrote, on the other hand, has simply distorted any understanding of the development of those genres since it imposes presupposed hypotheses upon the evidence of the period.<sup>30</sup>

We have, for example, spoken to medievalists who happily allow that, according to their own definitions, Livy, the last of the great Roman annalists, and whose history contains 140 books, wrote a 'chronicle'.<sup>31</sup> Conversely, consularia and much of what the Greeks and Romans called chronicles (*χρονικά*, *chronica*) would certainly be described by medievalists as annals (see Appendices 4 and 5 for examples): thus for the medievalist annals are chronicles and chronicles are annals. The words are familiar, but the meanings are not. When historians accept them and the modern hypotheses behind them as if they were representations of medieval reality,

<sup>30</sup> See 'Chapter 1, note 32' in the Appendices to the Footnotes, pp. 358–59 below.

<sup>31</sup> For the total number of Livy's books, see Barnes 1998: 209–12.

and when they then try to apply them to what medieval authors said and did, the result is a quagmire of circular analysis that tells us nothing about medieval historiography.<sup>32</sup>

We need to stress that our objection to modern medievalists' nomenclature is not a matter of bullying classicists trying to foist their own definition upon others. On the contrary, scholars of Assyrian and Babylonian chronicles describe their chronicles in the same fashion as do Greek, Roman, and late antique scholars:

Three basic traits characterize <Mesopotamian> chronicles. (1) They were written in prose, in the third person. This was the case even if this prose was reduced to a recurring formula and to a few more or less condensed chronological notes [...]. (2) Priority was given to time. The essential thing was to note the date of every event selected. There was an increasing tendency to leave no year unaccounted. (3) Brevity was the norm. Restricting themselves to the events they summarized, and running the risk of appearing brief to the point of atomization, chronicles were a kind of handbook that reduced history to a series of facts. (Glassner 2004: 38)<sup>33</sup>

A chronicle is a continuous register of events in chronological order. The events are simply enumerated in terse, often paratactic, sentences and the primary interest is in exact dating. A chronicle does not contain narrative; has no exposition about cause and effect; and offers no general background. It is a data base of facts about the past. (van der Spek 2008: 277)

As these prominent examples show, it is the terminology and the definitions of modern medievalists that are inconsistent with scholarly precedent in diverse other fields.<sup>34</sup> Nevertheless, although the descriptions of narrative history and chronicles

<sup>32</sup> For a typical example of the sort of problem this causes, see 'Chapter 1, note 32' in the Appendices to the Footnotes, pp. 358–59 below.

<sup>33</sup> We would draw the reader's attention particularly to this last sentence, which we regard as perhaps the best one-sentence definition of a chronicle we have seen, one that could only be improved by the addition of a single word: 'chronicles were a kind of handbook that reduced history to a series of *dated* facts'. By 'facts', we mean generally unadorned descriptions of events in the real world, which were intended to be accurate accounts of reality by the author. Unlike Stubbs 1867: xii–xiii (chronicles contain 'more of the invariable truth of facts' while history is filled with the 'variable element of speculation'), we of course do not believe that chronicles actually contain completely objective descriptions of reality, merely that it was their author's intention that they do so. Not every chronicle is like this, of course — Prosper and Hydatius in particular allow themselves a great latitude in commenting on the events they describe (see Appendix 5 below) — but the definition generally holds true.

<sup>34</sup> Of course, not all classicists are consistent in their definitions, though it must be admitted that very few of them have ever even thought about chronicles. Paul Christesen, on the basis of no apparent precedent, defines Olympiad chronicles as 'all historical works that were built around a framework of numbered Olympiads and named Olympic victors, regardless of the length and format of

that we shall present in the next section are based upon Near Eastern and classical models, the obvious analogues in medieval historiography can easily be recognized and distinguished; the next section, 'Genre 2: Chronicles and Classicizing History', and Appendix 2 will show that medieval and early humanist writers, from at least the time of Gervase of Canterbury at the beginning of the thirteenth century, perceived the nature of their own writings in this way as well.

Another important advantage in avoiding a term like 'annals' is the fact that it is used by scholars of different periods to describe quite different works. Leaving aside the various meanings of the word in Roman and medieval authors, medievalists use it to describe briefly annotated lists of dates, classicists use it to describe large multi-volume narrative histories of Rome's past written in the late republic, and Egyptologists and Near Eastern scholars use it to describe formulaic first-person, near-contemporary accounts of a single king's campaigns and victories, written as if dictated by that king and surviving today as inscriptions (see Chapter 2). Such inconsistent use of such an apparently simple word creates barriers and false assumptions when scholars from one field examine the work of others in a different field.<sup>35</sup>

Now an ecumenical view, which one must have if one is to study chronicles from the dawn of western civilization to the end of the Middle Ages, would treat the Middle Ages as the last of five stages in the development of the chronicle: Near

the historical notices supplied for each Olympiad' (Christesen 2007: 27 n. 61; see also pp. 27–28 and 296–97). As a result Diodorus Siculus (forty books), Dionysius of Halicarnassus (twenty books), and Dexippus (more than twelve books) wrote chronicles. This makes no more sense than lumping together in a single genre all works of Roman history that dated by consuls (say, Tacitus and the *Descriptio consulum*) or all medieval historical works that used *anni domini* (like Bede's *HE* and the *Annales Iuvauenses*). As an analytical tool it is valueless, since Olympiad dating of one kind or another was the standard method of universal historical dating from the Hellenistic period to the fifth century AD. (As we shall see in Chapter 2, only Apollodorus broke with tradition.) It is a lumping together of historical genres of which neither classicist nor medievalist could approve.

<sup>35</sup> This is particularly acute when medievalists venture into the ancient world: one often sees the claim that the Roman *Annales maximi* and the *annales* discussed by Aulus Gellius (quoted in Appendix 2) were somehow analogues or predecessors of medieval annals, yet this is quite false, not least because the former did not exist in the form that such writers assume, as we shall see in Volume II: the eighty books of the *Annales maximi* were an Augustan antiquarian compilation from earlier histories on a scale comparable to Livy, not the second-century publication of bare annalistic pontifical records, which is an invention of modern scholarship (see Frier 1999). One sometimes finds Tacitus's *Annals* mentioned in this context as well, but the titles *Histories* and *Annals* for his major works were first assigned in the sixteenth century on the basis of Isidore (quoted in Appendix 2).



Eastern – Greek – Roman – late antique – medieval.<sup>36</sup> Such an ecumenical view would also combine annals and chronicles within a single genre called ‘chronicle’ and define that single genre of chronicles much as we do in the next section, following precedents observable in definitions of *chronica* in contrast to *historia* between the twelfth and sixteenth centuries (Guenée 1973: 1001–16), in Cassiodorus and Isidore’s use of Jerome’s *Chronici canones* as the example par excellence of a chronicle, in Cassiodorus’s mid-sixth-century definition of the word ‘chronica’ (the earliest surviving definition; see below), and in the nature of the works to which the Greeks and Romans gave the name *χρονικά/chronica* (see Chapters 2, 3, and 5 below, and Appendix 1). In such an ecumenical definition, ‘classicizing’ annalistic (i.e. narrated year by year) narrative histories would remain what they had always been, histories, not chronicles — since this definition of ‘chronicle’ is an aberration of the late medieval period — and they would do so regardless of whatever title a late medieval historian may have given his work, and regardless of what modern historiographers have said from their sixteenth- to twenty-first-century points of view. Problems of definition will naturally arise with any attempt to strictly define genre, but that is in the nature of the question. For instance, one of the chief defining characteristics of a chronicle is its brevity. But at what point does the description of a year’s events cease to be brief and become a narrative history? There is no clear-cut answer and there is no point in looking for one: boundaries are always grey, never black or white. As Gervase said, ‘sunt plurimi qui cronicas uel annales scribentes limites suos excedunt’ (‘There are many writers of chronicles or annals who exceed their limits’; *Chron.*, prol., pp. 87–88). Gradations must be allowed and subgenres can be classified and named.<sup>37</sup> Heuristic terminology should be employed as a means of facilitating descriptions of past or present reality. It should not be so rigidly enforced that it actually changes the way we perceive that reality, and that point remains true even if we accept all that the linguistic turn has taught us about how words construct reality as much as they reflect or describe it. As noted above, at the end of this chapter readers will find a short postscript that sets forth our suggestions for this ecumenical vocabulary, one

<sup>36</sup> And we would class the important Byzantine developments, in Greek and Syriac, as well as other languages of the period, as medieval as well.

<sup>37</sup> For instance, there is considerable merit in recognizing ‘paschal chronicles’, i.e. medieval chronicles written within Easter tables or written in that style without the actual tables, as a sub-genre of chronicles, much as we distinguish consularia from chronicles (see below), as long as it is clear that such a distinction is not just a substitute for ‘annals’, with all the interpretative baggage that that word now has for medievalists, especially concerning generic origins.

that also provides the reader with a definition for all the terms used in this and following volumes.

The foregoing pages have been an exercise in debating nomenclature and will perhaps have gone on too long for many readers' tastes. But they are necessary if this work is to translate across disciplines and fields of study. Having presented these questions, we must turn to rather more detailed questions of genre as they affect the Greek and Roman worlds. First, it is important to distinguish chronicles from classicizing histories; we can then go on to distinguish between chronicles and consularia, which are a recognizable subset of the chronicle genre, and with it a major subject of this and future volumes.

## *Genre 2: Chronicles and Classicizing History*

The distinction between chronicles on the one hand and the genre that we call classicizing narrative history on the other was well known to antiquity and the later Middle Ages, though not distinguished by our level of terminological precision. We use the same vocabulary, but we define it more rigorously and add subgenres to take into account variants.

Let us begin by following the examples of Cassiodorus and Isidore. They defined chronicles simply by giving a well-known example of a chronicle: 'Chronica uero [...] scripsit Graece Eusebius; quae transtulit Hieronymus in Latinum, et usque ad tempora sua deduxit eximie' ('A chronicle [...] is what] Eusebius wrote in Greek and Jerome translated into Latin and continued so well down to his own time'; *Institutiones*, 1. 17. 2) and 'Chronica Graece dicitur quae Latine temporum series appellatur, qualem apud Graecos Eusebius Caesariensis episcopus edidit et Hieronymus presbyter in Latinam linguam conuertit' ('Chronicle is the Greek word for what is called a "sequence of events" in Latin;<sup>38</sup> the sort of work that among the Greeks Eusebius bishop of Caesarea produced and the priest Jerome translated into Latin'; *Etymologiae*, 5. 28). Examples of chronicles so defined begin with the annalistic historical accounts from Assyria and Babylonia. These are preserved on cuneiform tablets and are called 'chronicles' by modern Near Eastern scholars, the most significant being the Assyrian eponym chronicles and the Babylonian Chronicle series (see Chapter 2 and Appendix 3). Among Greek works, the Parian Marble, *Chronicon Romanum*, *POxy* I 12, and the works of Phlegon of

<sup>38</sup> The phrase as a synonym for 'chronica' would appear to be unique to Isidore, though Jerome used similar expressions (see Appendix 1 at note 21).

Tralles and Eusebius are (more or less) surviving examples of this sort of work (see Chapter 2 and Appendix 4), as are the Byzantine *Chronicon Paschale* and Χρονογραφία (*Chronographia*) of Theophanes (see Chapters 3 and 6). Later Latin works influenced by the earlier Greek exemplars are also chronicles: Jerome and his continuators, Prosper and Marcellinus *comes* (both cited by Cassiodorus), Hydatius, the Gallic chroniclers of 452 and 511, Cassiodorus, Victor of Tunnuna, Marius of Avenches, and John of Biclar. Equally, the earlier Latin tradition of consularia, including such works as the *Fasti Ostienses*, *Consularia Vindobonensia*, and *Consularia Hafniensia*, are also chronicles (see Chapters 4 and 5). To these we would add most of the annalistic works called *annales* by Pertz in MGH SS, some of the works called *chronica* by him, and other well-known works such as the *Annales regni Francorum*, the chronicle of Sigebert, and the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*. In Syriac, works like the chronicle of Jacob of Edessa and Ps-Dionysius of Tel-Mahre would also be included. It is with these specific works in mind that we use the word 'chronicle'. Comparison with 'classicizing' history will bring out the characteristics of this genre. As will be seen, what we are describing is more like what a modern medievalist would call 'annals' and what high medieval writers like Gervase of Canterbury were thinking of when they used the word 'chronica'/'chronicon'.

All the histories familiar to classicists share common characteristics of structure, content, and style: each has a beginning and an end (if not in fact, then at least in plan, as in the case of Thucydides) and consequently a focal theme or subject, usually one but sometimes several of similar or lesser importance; each is written in an elevated literary style suitable for the genre and attains to it with greater or lesser success; and each has a narrative structure that hangs on certain types of past events. These histories chart the progress of a war, the life and character of an individual or series of individuals, perhaps kings or emperors, or the history of a state or a city in a chronologically or thematically structured manner. Certain events are considered more important than others and so are granted lengthier treatment, with greater detail and comment, heightened language, and strategic positioning within the narrative. Language, content, and structure are varied to heighten the reader's interest and emotional engagement with the narrative, a process that often involves the use of speeches in direct and indirect discourse. Chronology is respected but it is not absolute: related events from different times can be narrated together or out of sequence. Finally, a narrator provides introductions and conclusions, explanations and analyses, summaries and digressions, commenting upon events and characters, sometimes in an overtly didactic, moralistic, or even propagandistic manner. It is this narrator who gives structure, coherence, meaning, and purpose to the events and people described.

Biographies, too, share these features and have an even more definite beginning and end; they also tend to follow the fairly strict patterns established for the genre in terms of development and the order of their narrative. Indeed, as time went on, narrative history could at times drift fairly close to biography, particularly because under the Roman Empire history came to be little more than the serial biographies of emperors, who were seen as the source of all important action and decision in history.

At all times, however, historical writing was considered a branch of literature and rhetoric, not a 'scientific' discipline. Authors were consequently more interested in style than in uncovering absolute truth, and still less in the novelty of their original research, the presentation of new facts or new interpretations. As Quintilian said, 'historia [...] est enim proxima poetis et quodammodo carmen solutum' ('history is nearest to the poets and is a kind of prose poem'; *Institutio oratoria*, 10. 1. 31).

In contrast to history and biography, chronicles were 'scientific' rather than literary genres, concerned first and foremost with the orderly reporting of chronology. They almost always dealt with much larger passages of time than did narrative histories, and the ordering of that past time was their *raison d'être*. Consequently, with a few exceptions, chronicles recount their historical statements with extreme brevity and in plain and simple language, devoid of the style and rhetoric expected in narrative history. There was simply no room for anything more, and in a 'scientific' genre anything more would have been deemed inappropriate.<sup>39</sup> In chronicles the chronological framework was usually provided by a continuous annual accounting of years.<sup>40</sup> With the text broken into annual blocks, each block could

<sup>39</sup> These distinctions are very much those that Gervase of Canterbury made between what he calls *historia* and *cronica* in the prologue to his chronicle: for example, the historian writes 'diffuse et eleganter' ('extensively and attractively') and 'dulci sermone et eleganti' ('with a pleasant and attractive style') about 'actus mores uitamque ipsius quem describit [...] nichilque aliud [...] nisi quod historiae de ratione uidetur competere' ('the deeds, character, and life of his subject [...] and nothing other than what seems in accordance with the principles of history'), while a chronicler advances 'simpliciter [...] et breuiter' ('simply [...] and briefly'), calculates years AD, months, and days (*kalendae*), and 'actus etiam regum et principum quae in ipsis eueniunt breuiter edocet, euentus etiam, portenta uel miracula commemorat' ('briefly teaches not only the deeds of kings and princes that took place at that time, but also records events, portents, and miracles') (*Chron.*, prol., p. 87).

<sup>40</sup> This is true of contemporary events, but when a chronicle like the Parian Marble deals with the very distant past, where only a few famous events or deeds were known, one finds only the record of these individual events with the 'unnecessary' chronological superstructure omitted (for

contain a brief statement about a historical event or events that the author regarded as interesting or important, but there was no necessity that every year contain such a statement. The reckoning of the annual blocks was the priority.<sup>41</sup> Once we understand this central importance of marking the annual passage of time, it becomes clear that consular fasti, whether in written form like the fasti of the *Chronograph of 354* or in a slightly more developed epigraphic form like the *Fasti Capitolini*, could be considered as the most basic type of chronicle, or rather proto-chronicle, in the way that a list of years AD cannot, because not only did the names of the two annually elected consuls represent the dates, but they also identified the two individuals who were the active military and legislative heads of the Roman state that year. Thus the names not only give the date, but they also conjure up the actions of famous consuls, as if 'Harold and William' could indicate not only the date 1066 but everything done by those two individuals in that year. Likewise, it is this annalistic structure that sets the brief historical accounts of chronicles apart from the brief historical accounts of epitomes and *breviaria*, such as the epitomes of Livy and the works of Velleius Paterculus, Florus, Aurelius Victor, Eutropius, and Rufinus, and the *Epitome de caesaribus*, as well as from the even briefer chronicle epitomes of Isidore and Bede (on which, see below).

From a modern reader's point of view, chronicles are most striking for the paratactic manner in which they present the information they record: events of all sorts seem to be piled together in a jumble, without any regard for their relative importance or the connections among them, let alone any overall sense of causation, continuity, or the relationship among events, which succeed one another in a relationship of *consécution* not *conséquence*, to use the terminology of Roland Barthes.<sup>42</sup> The annalistic chronology, not the content, imposes the explicit structure. There need not be any overall sense of progression, development, or narrative relevance

reasons of space and economy). Nevertheless, the exact number of years is constantly accounted for and set forth for each recorded event. Eusebius is the obvious exception to this general statement (others may have preceded him, but nothing of them survives): his regnal-year structure ensured that every year from the birth of Abraham was recorded, even when nothing was known about the events of most of the earliest years. This is true of consularia and medieval paschal chronicles as well. In their case the chronology was pre-existing, since the chronological structure was provided by consuls and *anni domini*, respectively, not regnal years. As we shall see, in the seventh century a different type of chronicle evolved, organized around the reigns of kings or emperors. This will be discussed below.

<sup>41</sup> For the same understanding of medieval chronicles, see White 1987: 8–9, 10–11, 15–16.

<sup>42</sup> Barthes 1977: 94–95.

in the way events are recounted; each fact can be listed in its proper chronological location, in conceptual isolation from the rest of the chronicle's entries. Readers can be left to make their own causal connections between and among the facts selected by the author: the authorial rationale is rarely overt and often unrecoverable. Obviously in some cases the selection of particular facts over a number of years, or an author's linking comments, may produce a narrative thrust of some sort, for instance the events of a specific emperor's reign or the fight against Arianism (as in Jerome's continuation of Eusebius), heresy more generally (as in Prosper), or the coming chaos that signals the end of the world (as in Hydatius). Even then, however, the reader is still required to pick out and isolate that narrative from the surrounding and apparently unconnected facts, because the author need not have provided either a rhetorical or a narratological structure as a guide to the process of differentiation. On the contrary, each entry can have been presented as if it were no less or no more important to the whole than any other entry.

Given its paratactic structure, the real heart of the chronicle lies in placing everything in its proper chronological relation to everything else. The rest of the work is done by the reader. The reader brings the hypotaxis and the syntaxis to his reading; the reader makes the connections and derives from the chronicler's lists the information he requires for his own purposes. He becomes, in other words, a fundamental part of the interpretative process, as he cannot be in reading a traditional history. There, the author has already made the decisions and provided the emphases and connections. The narrative belongs to him. In a chronicle, the reader makes his own history from the materials provided and makes whatever use of it he will.

This distinctive paratactic structure, common to the various chronographic genres with which we are dealing, is extremely severe in Assyrian and Babylonian chronicles, the Parian Marble, the *Chronicon Romanum*, Roman and late Roman consularia, and medieval paschal chronicles. On the other hand, the late antique chroniclers could be as explicit, biased, propagandistic, and committed to particular points of view as the most sophisticated author of narrative histories. Prosper in particular pushed the narratological boundaries of chronicles, chiefly in his final edition of 455, which is a single-minded attempt to tell the story of the rise and fall of the Eastern heretics Dioscorus and Eutyches, the threat of the Huns, and the lead up to the sack of Rome in 455. Again and again we find these chroniclers taking a didactic and subjective stance with regard to the events they relate, providing judgements on and emphasizing with length and detail the events that are deemed of greatest importance — anything but an anonymous collection of bare facts, in other words — and the same thing can be said of some of the chronicles of the

Middle Ages. On the other hand, the chronicles of Marcellinus *comes* and Marius of Avenches, and the two Gallic chronicles, for instance, are in general much more neutral and less subjective than the chronicles of Prosper and Hydatius. The same is true of Eusebius and Jerome's *Chronici canones*, though Jerome allows a strong anti-Arian bias to surface in his continuation. Nevertheless, in spite of these characteristics the fundamental parataxis remains throughout them all. Late Roman Christian chronicles thus allowed more rhetorical flexibility than consularia and paschal chronicles did, but the principle by which the reckoning of time supersedes the narrative structure remains normative regardless of the subgenre.

This paratactic structure became the norm in chronicles for a number of reasons. First of all, the annalistic format is fundamentally restrictive. By dividing the page physically into year-long sections (often referred to as a 'tabular' structure), one also automatically divides the events to be recounted into the years in which they occurred. If large periods of history were to be covered within a reasonable space, brevity was essential. The space available permitted little beyond the simple recounting of facts. If all world history, or even, for instance, the history of Attica from the time of Cecrops, was to be narrated annalistically, with every year accounted for, a classicizing narrative, however brief, was impossible. And so, in a chronicle everything that might add unnecessary bulk was jettisoned, leaving the all-important chronological superstructure and the bare recitation of facts. These, in consequence, had to speak for themselves.

Given their lack of extensive rhetorical interpretation or analysis, a major function of chronicles and consularia was therefore to serve as aides-mémoires, offering a guide to the absolute and relative chronologies of the important events of the past, the details of which educated readers would already know. Cicero read and enjoyed Atticus's chronicle, the *Liber annalis*, not to learn what sort of man Cato was or the details of his legislation, but in order to get a quick overview of the chronology of his life and works and their chronological relationship to other events. Similarly, a medieval chronicler would assume that later readers of his paschal chronicle would recognize the names and events recorded, which mostly involved a monastery, its local area, and the famous leaders of the time. The purpose of the chronicle was to organize those memories and put everything in its proper chronological relationship to everything else. This important fact about the genre's purpose is too often ignored in discussions of chronicles. This is no doubt what Cassiodorus meant when he said that a chronicle was 'imagines historiarum brevissimaeque commemorationes temporum' ('sketches of historical events and quite brief surveys of the past'; *Institutiones*, 1. 17. 2).

This quotation from Cassiodorus raises the most obvious and important characteristic of the chronicle genre: brevity. Cassiodorus says in the introduction to

his chronicle that he has written it so that his dedicatee ‘blando compendio longissimam mundi percurrat aetatem’ (‘may skim through the very long age of the world in pleasant brevity’); Eusebius closes the preface to his *Chronici canones* with the comment (in Jerome’s Latin translation), ‘Quae uniuersa in suis locis cum summa breuitate ponemus’ (‘All of this I have placed in its correct context with the utmost brevity’); Victorius of Aquitaine praises Prosper’s chronicle for its ‘egregia breuitate’ (‘outstanding brevity’); and Gervase said that chronicles were written ‘simpliciter [...] et breuiter’ (‘simply and briefly’).<sup>43</sup> And this is all true: Tacitus covered the eighty-three years between 14 and 96 in thirty books; Jerome covered the same period in just over twenty-one manuscript pages; Prosper reduced that to just over nine MGH pages (even fewer manuscript pages). Livy expended 140 books on the history of Rome from c. 753 to 9 BC; Jerome did the same in ninety-eight manuscript pages, while including the history of the Greeks, Hebrews, Macedonians, Persians, and Alexander’s successor kingdoms, among many others. Livy said nothing of these. In chronicles, then, years are measured in pages not books. This is still true in the Middle Ages when chronicles were not the universal chronicles that earlier chronicles were, with only a few lines of description per year, but more developed annalistic accounts of contemporary history, where the narrative of each year could cover a page or two (or more) of a modern edition. The *Annales regni Francorum*, for instance, in its final redaction covers the years between 741 and 829 in approximately 120 MGH pages (allowing for the duplication in the first half of the text), which is about a page and a third per year on average. Jerome could cover over 660 years before his own time in the same space, but no classical historian — Thucydides, Polybius, Livy, Tacitus, or Ammianus — could cover a year in a page and a third. These comparisons of scale speak for themselves.

Cicero summed up the virtues of the chronicle genre best when he said that Atticus’s *Liber annalis* allowed one to view all history ‘uno in conspectu’ (‘at a single glance’; *Brutus*, 15). In the *Brutus* and the *Cato* in particular, Cicero used the *Liber annalis* to jump back and forth through short and long stretches of history with ease, to see the exact chronological relationships between and among near and distant events and people, on both a small and a large scale. When history is presented ‘uno in conspectu’, the reader sees the forest, not the trees. That is impossible with a standard classicizing history, written in many books of dense literary prose. Read end to end, a work like that of Livy or Tacitus could be useful for its literary, rhetorical, moral, and didactic value. But how could a Roman reader have

<sup>43</sup> Cassiodorus, *Institutiones*, 1. 17. 2 and *Chronica*, 1; Eusebius, *Chronici canones*, praef. (p. 19. 6–7); Victorius of Aquitaine, *Cursus paschalis*, praef. 7; and Gervase, *Chronica*, prol. (p. 87).



used those authors to easily grasp his own history? How could he, for instance, have found the events for the year when L. Aemilius Paullus and C. Terentius Varro were consuls (our 216 BC), or determined how long that was after the sack of the city by the Senones (390 BC, by the standard reckoning) or before the year when C. Marius and Cn. Papirius Carbo were consuls (82 BC)? In classicizing history, one has no choice but to consider the details; it is impossible to obtain an overview. For that purpose, classicizing history was in fact virtually useless, unless one undertook extensive annotation, indexing, or epitomization.<sup>44</sup> Chronicles could not instruct a reader in the relative merits of the Gracchi or Marius, or why the Social War broke out, but they did provide, in short order, the relative chronological position of these people and events and their relationship to the rest of Roman history. As in these Latin examples, so too for Egyptian, Assyrian, Babylonian, and Hellenistic chronicles brevity is the key. This can be seen from the examples translated in the appendices, where several years and more can be covered in a single page of text instead of a single book. This Ciceronian idea of ‘uno in conspectu’, then, lies at the very heart of what a chronicle is, from the earliest examples in the twenty-fifth century BC to the twelfth century AD and beyond, and that is true whether it reports one event or many events from every year, or only certain important events from just a selection of years. If it isn’t brief, it isn’t a chronicle (and there is no point arguing the definition of ‘brief’, because it is wholly dependent on context).

Brevity, however, imposed a massive restriction upon the compilers and composers of chronicles, one that did not operate for the writers of classicizing history and biography: the former had little latitude with regard to the length of their work. By their very nature, chronicles forced authors to cover history over the long term. One could not produce an independent chronicle covering a period of only a few years or even a few decades, because such a work would extend to only a few pages (note the comparisons of Tacitus and Livy with Jerome just above). A chronicler was forced either to start at the end of someone else’s work or to encompass all history from some set beginning point. Traditional beginnings included the first Athenian or Greek king, the Trojan War, the first Olympiad, or the foundation

<sup>44</sup> The same problems were noted by the author of the *Σύνοψις χρονική* (whom we shall call Theodorus Scutariotes, though it is unlikely that he was; see *ODB*, 1912–13) (pp. 3–4). Note the comment of Geiger 2008: 64, ‘Livy’s history became, as far as its popular reception and response was concerned, a failure. It collapsed under its own weight since no one but scholars could master its bulk, and it soon had to be replaced by abbreviated versions.’ As we shall see in Volume II, one of those abbreviations was structured exactly like a chronicle.

of Rome. In later Christian chronicles, the creation of the world or Adam was the obvious starting point, and in the Middle Ages it was often the birth of Christ or the first of the Carolingians.<sup>45</sup> A narrative historian or biographer could start with the beginning of a certain war, the first clash between two rivals or enemies, or the birth or family of a biographical subject: the level of detail expected allowed for much smaller horizons, unless like Diodorus, Dionysius, or Livy one was planning a very large work indeed. In narrative history, only a work of enormous size could provide the chronological coverage that a chronicle could provide in a single book or a few books: Diodorus was forty books, Dionysius twenty, and Livy one hundred and forty.

If chroniclers had little difficulty in settling on a starting point, the opposite was true with their complete lack of fixed endings. They simply stopped abruptly when the narrative reached the date of writing, an important recent event, or the end of the previous ruler's reign. This is not accidental. As a genre, chronicles were not regarded as having fixed end points. They should carry on for as long as individuals continued to exist and events continued to take place: 'A chronicle might then be described as almost by definition a living text.'<sup>46</sup> The compilation of chronicles was therefore understood as a collaborative effort lasting through the generations. Chroniclers expected, or at least hoped, that their chronicles would be continued.<sup>47</sup> Often those hopes were satisfied: the *Fasti Ostienses* was continued

<sup>45</sup> The *Paschale Campanum* is an exception to this pattern because it begins with a new cycle in the Easter calendar (see below, notes 90–91 and Appendix 5, and Volume II). Inscribed consularia are a different case, since there were other local points at which one could start (such as the Social War) and cost and materials had to be taken into account: too early a starting date might have been neither practical nor economical. It must be remembered, too, that although in many editions medieval chronicles are just a few pages long, almost always hundreds of years are covered in those pages, not just a few years. In addition, one often finds (especially in MGH *Scriptores*) that the editor has removed the introductory or supporting text to save space and present only the original material, giving an inaccurate impression of the work as a whole. Sometimes, too, extremely brief paschal chronicles in the *Scriptores* series are just collections of random notes and were not even the result of a conscious action of compilation or creation.

<sup>46</sup> Dumville 2002: 21. See esp. pp. 18–21 and White 1987: 1–25, especially pp. 5, 8–9, 16, 17, 21, 23–25.

<sup>47</sup> See the last part of Hydatius's preface (pp. 74–75): 'Haec iam quidem inserta, sed posteris in temporibus quibus offenderint reliquimus consummanda' ('Such then are the contents of the present volume, but I have left it to my successors <to include an account of> the Last Days, at that time at which they encounter them'). He twice expresses worry at his ignorance of whether Jerome had continued his own chronicle or not (introduction and praef. 4, pp. 70–73).

for over 175 years and the chronicles of Eusebius, Jerome, Prosper, Marcellinus, and Victor of Tunnuna were all formally continued during the fourth to sixth centuries (one sequence was Eusebius – Jerome – Prosper – Victor – John of Biclar) while Prosper and Marcellinus even added their own continuations to their works, as perhaps did Hydatius. The *Descriptio consulum* shows a continuous process of updating from the 340s (at least) to 389 and thence sporadically to 468, and the same process occurred in the *Consularia Italica* from at least the last quarter of the fourth century to 493. Now it is true that classical historians had composed continuations of the works of earlier historians: Xenophon, Theopompus, and the ‘Oxyrhynchus historian’ continued Thucydides, Polybius continued Timaeus, Posidonius continued Polybius, and Eunapius continued Dexippus. Yet no classicizing historian would have anonymously appended his work to the end of an earlier historian in order to form a single monolithic compendium, as chroniclers regularly did.<sup>48</sup> Neither would any classical historian have intentionally stopped his history *medias in res*, as happens regularly in chronicles. The genres were simply different in conception. As we shall see in Chapter 2, the same is true for Assyrian and Babylonian chronicles. Consequently, an important criterion frequently used to distinguish between medieval ‘annals’ and chronicles — that ‘annals’ were written by multiple anonymous authors or compilers, while a chronicle was written by a single named author as a ‘monograph’ — is invalid when viewed in the context of the development of the Mediterranean chronicle tradition as a whole.

The basic characteristics of chronicles that we have been outlining — annalistic reckoning of time, paratactic structure, lack of a fixed ending, and, in particular, brevity — serve to distinguish them from classicizing history.<sup>49</sup> But they likewise separate chronicles from a variety of other texts that are often treated alongside them or even called chronicles by contemporaries or modern scholars: compendia of Old Testament genealogies, regnal lists (which Mommsen called *laterculi* and Pertz called *catalogi regum*), and/or episcopal lists, such as the *Συναγωγὴ χρόνων*/

<sup>48</sup> The continuations of Caesar’s Gallic war and civil war commentaries — book eight for the *Gallic War* and the *Alexandrian War*, by Aulus Hirtius, and the anonymous *Bellum Africum* and *Bellum Hispaniense* — could be seen as a partial exception to this, but the commentaries are not histories properly speaking.

<sup>49</sup> See also Guenée 1973: 1004–15 for medieval and early humanist definitions that are very much the same, esp. ‘L’un et l’autre genre se distinguaient par deux traits: les chroniques se reconnaissaient à leur brièveté alors que les histoires donnaient des récits détaillés; les chronographes suivaient pas à pas la chronologie tandis que les historiographes, relativement libérés de l’ordre des temps, regroupaient la suite des faites par règne, par sujet, par matière. Telles sont les seules différences qui aient jamais été mises, jusqu’à la fin du XIV<sup>e</sup> siècle, entre *histoires* et *chroniques*’ (p. 1008).

*Liber generationis* (described in Chapter 3); the many similar but much later Byzantine compendia of multiple regnal and patriarchal lists; and chronological calculations (*computationes* and *supputationes*), of whatever length, and various combinations of these, are not chronicles, since they are just compilations of lists. Julius Africanus wrote a Χρονογραφία (*Chronographiae*) in 221 that seems to have been the inspiration and model for Eusebius's Χρονογραφία (*Chronographia*; the first volume of his chronicle) and both works were the inspiration for George Syncellus's much later Ἐκλογὴ χρονογραφίας (*Ecloga chronographica*), at the beginning of the ninth century. Africanus's work was certainly chiefly concerned with chronology, but in a mathematical or computistic and apologetic manner, and it was composed of chronological calculations, detailed analyses and arguments, digressions, and regnal lists, not the setting forth of history year by year or 'uno in conspectu'. It is a technical work that is based upon history, but it is not a recounting of that history. Syncellus produced a work that for the most part imitated Africanus and the first book of Eusebius. However, although he did include lemmata that marked individual years for the Roman Empire, in imitation of the *Chronici canones*, these lemmata only mark the year of each emperor's accession. Within the blocks created by these lemmata Syncellus notes the events of the reign (not necessarily in exact chronological order) and includes for that reign in a lump at the end the number, city, name, and term of each of the bishops of Rome, Antioch, Alexandria, and Jerusalem, always in that order. In this reign-by-reign approach to the overview of history, Syncellus was anticipated by Isidore and Bede in their chronicle epitomes (see below). Thus neither the work of Africanus nor that of Syncellus was a chronicle, since they make no attempt to create an annalistic account of history, though Syncellus does approach a chronicle more closely than Africanus with his reign-by-reign summary of the history of the Roman Empire. On the other hand, the sequel to Syncellus, the *Chronographia* of Theophanes, is a proper chronicle, since it returns to the annalistic accounting of every year, whether anything is recorded for that year or not. This reappearance of a true chronicle in the early ninth century was probably more the result of influence from Syriac chronicles than it was a response to anything in the Greek tradition. Similarly, much of Byzantine historiography after Eusebius that is described as 'chronicle' by modern scholarship was not written in the form of a chronicle, but rather of the *breviarium*, a greatly condensed narrative history. The histories of Malalas, John of Antioch, Symeon the Logothete, George the Monk, Cedrenus, Glycas, Zonaras, and Theodorus Scutariotes, for instance, are all *breviaria* of one sort or another, not chronicles, since they are not primarily concerned with chronology and do not provide annual paratactic accounts of events, but are rather summaries of events

arranged by king or emperor. They are the Byzantine analogues of the abbreviated Latin histories of Velleius Paterculus, Florus, the *periochae* of Livy, Eutropius, Festus, and Aurelius Victor; of the *Epitome de caesaribus*; and of the works of Isidore and Bede, all of which are clearly not chronicles, but rather epitomes (short condensations of or compilations from an existing work or works) or *breviaria* (short histories). Because such works do not have an annalistic structure they can be even briefer than chronicles. Of major surviving Byzantine works before Theophanes, only the *Chronicon Paschale* of c. 630 is a chronicle, though when its sources force the matter, it too abandons much of its brevity and its annalistic chronology.

Similarly, the two works that mark the transition from late antiquity to the Middle Ages — the ‘chronicles’ of Isidore in the seventh century and Bede in the eighth — are quite different from any Latin or Greek chronicle that went before them. Looking for an even more compact method of presenting world history from Creation than a regular universal chronicle like Jerome’s, Isidore seems to have taken his cue from Prosper’s epitome of Jerome, which reduced about 240 pages of Jerome from the birth of Abraham to the crucifixion (where Prosper started recording year by year) to about twenty-four MGH pages. To do this Prosper had increased the basic chronological unit from the year, as it was in Jerome, to the reign. And unlike Jerome, who had listed the rulers of every major Mediterranean kingdom, Prosper listed only those who could provide a single line of chronology from Creation to the crucifixion: Jewish patriarchs, judges, and kings, Persian kings, Alexander, the Ptolemies, and Roman emperors. He also noted the seven kings of Rome, but Isidore did not imitate him in this. Isidore copied Prosper’s structure, epitomized Jerome’s text with even more ruthlessness, and also marked the advancing *anni mundi* alongside each new regnal accession, which Prosper had not done. He thus allowed readers to work out roughly the relative chronologies of only the most important events of biblical, Greek, Hellenistic, and Roman history. The result is not a chronicle proper but simply a severely edited list of rulers that has been heavily annotated from Jerome. The text is divided into chronicle-like blocks by lemmata that note the name of each ruler and number of years from Creation to (usually) his death, and this chronicle-like appearance has been enhanced by modern editors, who have broken the text up into single entries in order to facilitate reading and source identification.<sup>50</sup>

<sup>50</sup> It is hard to know what Isidore himself called his work, but he almost certainly never called it a ‘chronicle’, which he considered a foreign term (*Etymologiae*, 5.28). Nevertheless, he clearly saw himself as writing within the chronicle tradition of Africanus, Eusebius-Jerome, and Victor (see *Chron.*, 1–2) and uses similar Latin expressions to describe his work and chronicles. For a listing

The changes undertaken by Isidore are substantial enough to make these works quite different from any earlier chronicle, apart from the first epitomized section of Prosper's, since they abandon the annalistic structure that is such a fundamental part of chronicles before and after. We shall adopt the term 'chronicle epitome' or just 'epitome' to describe them, taking our cue from Prosper's description of his epitome of Jerome, 'epitoma chronicorum' ('epitome of (Jerome's) chronicle'), since they are almost entirely epitomized from existing works, particularly actual chronicles. This usage will highlight the difference between them and both regular annalistic chronicles and *breviaria* or epitome histories (both Roman and Byzantine), which have no real interest in chronology.

Isidore produced three editions of his chronicle epitome: two of the full version in 615 and 626 and an even shorter epitome of his epitome for his later *Etymologiae*. It was the latter that served as the major inspiration for Bede's first chronicle epitome of 703, which he included as chapters sixteen to twenty-two of his *De temporibus*. He later greatly expanded the historical coverage for each reign in his second and more important chronicle epitome of 725, which appeared as chapter sixty-six of his *De temporum ratione*.

A similar type of historical work appeared in the Byzantine Empire as well, seemingly beginning in the ninth century. Short histories like the *Chronicon Bruxellense*, the Χρονικὸν ἐπίτομον (*Short Chronicle*), Χρονογραφικὸν σύντομον (*Abridged Chronography*) of Nicephorus, and the *Anonymus Matritensis* are structured in the same way as Isidore and Bede, with lemmata noting the length of reign for each king or emperor, usually accompanied by short annotations, often only one sentence long; they are, like Isidore and Bede, nothing more than regnal lists annotated from existing chronicles, and that no doubt reflects their origin. They are simply greatly reduced versions of the type of history we see in George the Monk and Symeon the Logothete. The major difference between these Byzantine examples and their Latin predecessors is that the Byzantine texts do not demonstrate the continuous, overall interest in chronology that we find in Isidore and Bede. In fact, they do not seem to exhibit any interest in chronology at all. And while the works of George and Symeon are epitomes or *breviaria*, the *Chronicon Bruxellense*, *Anonymus Matritensis*, and other such works are best described as compact epitomes — since they are really epitomized epitomes — or even 'chronicalized' epitomes, that is, epitomes made to be more like chronicles in brevity and structure, and should be distinguished from the chronicle epitomes of Isidore and Bede.

of the terms Isidore used to describe these works, see 'Chapter 1, note 50' in the Appendices to the Footnotes, pp. 359–60 below.

The foregoing discussion of genre and generic terminology has dealt only in small part with the question of meaning and interpretation in representations of the past. Chronicles have no obvious internal narrative thread, as do narrative histories. They are not required to instruct their readers in the specific value of the events they record. They do, however, possess an overall or 'macro-narrative', which is implicit in the totality of chronology, events, and individuals accumulated in a text.<sup>51</sup> This was true of earlier Egyptian, Assyrian, and Babylonian chronicles, later medieval chronicles, as well as in the Graeco-Roman tradition with which we are chiefly concerned. The meaning of history for a chronicle lay not in the details, but in the overall picture offered by the complete work, in which one could trace the rise and fall of empires, cities, and cultures — one need only think of the eighteen different Mediterranean kingdoms charted in Eusebius's *Chronici canones* that resolve themselves into the single thread of the Roman Empire — as well as the development of intellectual pursuits in poetry, drama, history, and philosophy that are so much a part of the Hellenistic chronicle tradition. Each example of a chronicle is therefore a mosaic, and every entry is a single coloured tessera of marble. Each tessera has limited individual meaning. It may be attractive or appealing for its colour or texture in its own context, or in relation to the tesserae around it, but it only takes on greater importance when seen from a distance and viewed with all the other tesserae that make up the design of the entire mosaic. This is even true to a limited extent for plain consular fasti, epigraphic or manuscript. For as we have suggested above, the simplest list of the consuls and censors in itself represented the continuing history of Rome and Roman traditions in a way that a simple list of the kings or emperors of Rome fundamentally did not. Fasti without historical entries were copied and recopied throughout the imperial period, each new set extended to the date of completion.<sup>52</sup> None could be used as a practical or daily guide for dating; each existed solely for historical and antiquarian reasons, providing a shape to history that was meaningful only at a macrocosmic level.

Later, Christian chroniclers heaped new and different layers of meaning upon the chronicle format. For Christians, chronicles could, for instance, function as accounts of divine Providence operating through human history. Since it was expected that

<sup>51</sup> This question of determining exactly what kind of 'narrative' is recounted in a chronicle is a fundamental part of White 1987: 6–16.

<sup>52</sup> See Burgess 2000. As Ausonius said at the end of his compilation of fasti: 'Hactenus ascripsi fastos. Si sors uolet, ultra | adiciam; si non, qui legis adicies' ('Thus far have I composed my fasti. If Fortune allows, I shall continue them further. If not, you, dear reader, will do so'; *Fasti*, 3. 1–2, R. Green 1991: 161).

the world would end at some future date with the return of Christ, Christian chronicles could also be teleological. That is to say, they were written in anticipation of the goal towards which all human history was believed to be advancing.<sup>53</sup> Like the Babylonians, some Christians believed that a study of the past would give insight into the future, particularly the date of the coming *consummatio mundi*, or end of the world.<sup>54</sup> The intense Christian interest in chronography and the age of the world documents this belief (see Chapter 3 below). Other Christians believed that understanding history gave one an understanding of God's purpose for mankind. Viewed in that light, a chronicler could envisage himself as adding another section to a long record of the outline of God's ultimate plan. When the outline was completed, at Christ's Second Coming (the *Parousia*), all human history would stand revealed in a single written work, a work of reverence for God's Creation.

Having said that, we should also emphasize that Christian chroniclers, like the Greek chroniclers of the third century BC or Babylonian chroniclers of the seventh, could compose chronicles simply out of historical and antiquarian enthusiasm. That is certainly one of the major purposes that Eusebius and Jerome endorse in their prefaces.<sup>55</sup> That is to say, however different their outlook on the world may have been, Christian chroniclers could take up their pens for exactly the same reasons as had their non-Christian predecessors.<sup>56</sup> We rarely have explicit statements of purpose or even clear implicit evidence of these motives, however, since apart from Eusebius, Jerome, and Hydatius few chroniclers explained why they were writing. For that reason, it is generally dangerous to speculate too precisely about an individual chronicler's historiographical viewpoint, although we can nevertheless study chronicles within a range of possible interpretations.

<sup>53</sup> For a wide-ranging collection of the different Christian interpretations of chronicles and chronography, see Milburn 1954, esp. pp. 54–73, and most recently Cardelle de Hartmann 2000: 112–23; Croke 2001a: 152, 168, 214–15, 257–65; Dunphy 2004: 201–04; and Meier 2007: 240–47. Van Nuffelen 2010 is an important paper that shows that a number of unquestioned interpretations of how Christian history was conceived in late antiquity, especially its supposed universality, are not in fact true.

<sup>54</sup> Hydatius saw increasing chaos in politics and nature as signs of the coming end of the world. See Burgess 1996; Kulikowski 2004: 153–56.

<sup>55</sup> Jerome, *Chronici canones*, praef., pp. 4–19, esp. pp. 18–19. For Eusebius's purposes in writing the *Canones*, see Burgess 1997: 488–95.

<sup>56</sup> As Van Nuffelen 2010: 171 says, 'for Christians in late antiquity, just as for their non-Christian contemporaries, history is in the first place a discipline in its own right, not a subcontractor for theology'.



We stress this point because despite the documentable connections with much earlier historiographical traditions, and for all their clear roots in the distant past, late Roman chronicles continue to be defined in terms of Christian historiography, or, even worse, medieval Christian historiography. All the fundamental aspects of chronicles that we have been discussing in this section have in the past been attributed to a quintessentially Christian view of the world, yet every single one of them was directly inherited from the Hellenistic Greek chronicle. In fact, apart from certain apocalyptic, providentialist, or teleological interpretations that may exist in late Roman and medieval chronicles, there is nothing inherently Christian in the chronicle genre at all. Christians simply discovered that the chronicle form satisfied or fulfilled the requirements of their own historiographical outlook and historical philosophy. As we shall see in Chapter 2, most of their requirements were exactly the same as those of chroniclers in the Roman Republic, Hellenistic Greece, Babylonia, and Assyria. Once it is realized that chronicles (or ‘annals’) are not an invention of the Middle Ages, or even of Africanus or Eusebius, it becomes impossible to maintain the fundamentally ‘Christian’ nature of these works, as is so often done.

The foregoing analysis should by now have made clear that we are actually urging something that some may find quite revolutionary for the interpretation of medieval historiography: that the writing of history in the Middle Ages be seen not as *sui generis*, but as a direct continuation of all that went before. In a sense, we are advocating that medieval historiography catch up with the revolution that has defined the period now called late antiquity and abandon its belief in the isolation of the Middle Ages from the past. For, like it or not, the Middle Ages are a conceptual creation of modernity, indeed of Renaissance Italy, which needed a *medium aeuum* if it was to construct itself as a rebirth of all that was good in the ancient past. Placing medieval historiography in the context of its long, continuous past will mean abandoning some of the basic generic definitions that have guided medievalists for over two hundred years and replacing them with new definitions that are more careful, more subtle, and more grounded in the evidence of genre that ancient and medieval writers would themselves have recognized.

### *Genre 3: Chronicles and Consularia*

Before turning to a summary of our definitions, and then to the ancient prehistory of late antique chronicles, we must examine in more detail the distinction between chronicles and consularia, which we treat here as another subgenre of chronicles. Consularia existed only during the Roman period, and though they began as a separate Roman genre, they were absorbed into chronicles in late antiquity. Both

chronicles and consularia can use consuls as their chief chronological system, but that does not make them same thing. When looking at the differences between chronicles and consularia, we are faced with a sliding scale of generic characteristics rather than consistent black-and-white distinctions, just as is true of the medieval transition between chronicles and longer annalistic narrative histories. Few extant texts are 'pure' chronicle or 'pure' consularia; nearly all stand at some point along a continuum between those poles. After the two genres began to merge, especially in the sixth century, the distinction between the two is virtually impossible to make and serves no purpose except as an aid to *Quellenforschung*. Despite their eventual absorption into the Latin chronicle genre proper, consularia were composed from different sources and had a different origin, as well as different structure, content, and style, so the distinction remains worthwhile. It is also worth reiterating what we said above in our initial discussion of nomenclature: the detailed distinctions and terminology that we use here reflect a completely modern taxonomy. We do not claim that our terminology was ever used by the ancients in this way, but that the generic distinctions to which we have assigned a precise terminology were real, were recognized by the Romans, and remain recognizable to this day.<sup>57</sup> As the less well understood of the two genres, we may turn to consularia first.

As the very name suggests, the heart of consularia is the consular list. So important is the consular list that in the preface to his so-called chronicle (which is actually a form of consularia) Cassiodorus mentions nothing else: if we had only his preface we would assume that he had done nothing more than produce a revised version of the *fasti*.<sup>58</sup> Consularia lack other subordinate chronological systems such as one finds in chronicles, for instance Olympiads, years of Abraham, indictions, *anni Domini*, *anni ab incarnatione*, *anni a passione*, or *anni mundi*. The consular *fasti* are the *raison d'être* for consularia, just as they are more obviously for the unannotated consular *fasti* from which consularia developed. The consularia of late antiquity that survive only in manuscript form are the direct descendants of the inscribed *fasti* and consularia of the early empire, like the *Fasti Ostienses*, and they served the same antiquarian purpose. Although it cannot be proved, it is likely that the development of *fasti* into consularia in the last half of the first century BC owed

<sup>57</sup> This entire exercise to identify consularia has been strongly condemned by Brian Croke. A discussion of his objections and our responses to them can be found in 'Chapter 1, note 57' in the Appendices to the Footnotes, pp. 360–61 below.

<sup>58</sup> 'In ordinem me consules digerere censuistis ut [...] redderetis fastis ueritatis pristinae dignitatem' ('You have directed me to set out the consuls in order that [...] you may restore to the *fasti* their ancient authority'; *Chron.*, praef.).

something to the appearance and popularity of the first Latin chronicles, which were written earlier in the same century by Cornelius Nepos and T. Pomponius Atticus. In this way, the native Roman interest in the list of annual consuls and quinquennial censors merged with Greek traditions, based on archons and Olympiads, via Nepos and Atticus to produce a Roman hybrid. This early imperial genre today survives almost entirely in epigraphic form, but as we shall see in Chapter 4 the late antique consularia tradition descends directly from it and was therefore completely independent of the late antique chronicle tradition in its origins.

Late antique Latin chronicles, unlike consularia, drew either their immediate or ultimate inspiration not from the indigenous Latin chronicle tradition, a phenomenon confined to the late republic, but rather from Jerome's translation and continuation of Eusebius's *Chronici canones*, though only two extant chronicles — Hydatius and the *Gallic Chronicle of 452* — were written as exact and direct continuations of Jerome. All these chronicles use imperial regnal years as the main basis of their chronology, but they include years since the birth of Abraham and Olympiads as subordinate chronological systems, both adopted from Eusebius and the latter from the Hellenistic chronicle tradition, as we shall see in Chapter 2. Every five hundred years Eusebius and Jerome included a notice of how many Jubilees (a Jewish chronological period of fifty years) had elapsed from the Jewish date of Creation, but no continuator or imitator sustained these.<sup>59</sup> Hydatius, for his part, also included Spanish eras and a countdown of Jubilees to what he believed would be the end of the world.<sup>60</sup> All these chronicles used multiple chronological systems, but these were controlled by a central principle of organization by regnal year.<sup>61</sup>

Similarly, even later chronicles that replaced regnal years with consular dating and show influence from consularia — for instance those of Marcellinus *comes* and Prosper — nevertheless still derive structurally and conceptually directly from Jerome's chronicle and not from consularia. All were written as direct or indirect continuations of Jerome.<sup>62</sup> However, using consuls was much easier and more

<sup>59</sup> Jerome, *Chron.*, 22a<sup>a</sup>, 46a<sup>b</sup>, 73a<sup>b</sup>, 109<sup>a</sup>, 174<sup>a</sup>, 223<sup>h</sup> = beginning of Jubilees 41, 51, 61, 71, 81, and 86.

<sup>60</sup> See Burgess 1993: 31–35, and note 54 above.

<sup>61</sup> Because it is an epitome, or even an epitome of an epitome, it is difficult to say whether the *Gallic Chronicle of 511* originally continued a full text of Jerome or an epitome of him, and what sort of chronological structure it contained besides regnal years. But there is no doubt that it did follow Jerome in one form or other since it is still preceded by an epitome of his chronicle: see Burgess 2001b: 85–91.

<sup>62</sup> Marcellinus *comes* wrote in continuation of Jerome but he abandoned Jerome's chronological apparatus of regnal years, Olympiads, and years from the birth of Abraham under the influence of

accurate than were regnal years, which had never been a usual form of dating in the West, although they had long been used in the East, whence the Latin tradition developed.<sup>63</sup> By contrast with the clear influence of consularia on chronicles, only one extant example of consularia shows any awareness of Jerome's chronicle.<sup>64</sup>

consularia and exchanged them for consuls and indictions, the fifteen-year tax cycle regularized by Diocletian (see *ODB*, 993). Prosper wrote a continuation of his own epitome of Jerome and, also under the influence of consularia, he too abandoned Jerome's chronology for consuls and years counted from the crucifixion. Marius of Avenches continued Prosper's chronicle, but because he lacked sources apart from a few consularia in the half century or so after Prosper, the beginning of his chronicle looks like almost pure consularia. Victor of Tunnuna also continued Prosper, and John of Biclar continued Victor, each in the same style as his exemplar and each perpetuating that exemplar's chronological defects. Justinian had suppressed the consulship for anyone other than the emperor in 541, and Victor abandoned dating by post-consulates of the last private consul, Basilius, in 564 in favour of the regnal years of the eastern emperors; John followed suit, adding Visigothic regnal years for good measure. As can be seen, therefore, even chronicles that used consuls to structure their annalistic framework descend from the tradition of Jerome, merely deploying alternative chronological systems in place of his unwieldy now-archaic ones.

<sup>63</sup> It is worth noting here that consular years are conceptually and practically quite different from regnal years. This is demonstrated most clearly by the way accession years are treated in chronicles using the two systems. In a chronicle that uses regnal years, the last event of the last regnal year of an emperor is almost always that emperor's death, and the first event of the next regnal year is his successor's accession. That approach is necessary because a regnal year is a conceptual placeholder for a calendar year: although regnal years were usually thought of as normal civic calendar years, transitional years, the years of death and succession, had to be split into two, usually with an emperor's accession noted in the year it actually occurred and his death noted in the year before it occurred (though Jerome reversed that rule: see Burgess 1999: 42–43). This causes problems when a transitional year was particularly eventful (see Burgess 1999: 233–37 for an example). In a chronicle with consular dating, both events can happen one right after the other in the same consular year, just as they occurred in real life, since consular years *are* civic calendar years. The difference in the treatment of transitional years can be seen most easily by comparing Prosper's epitome of Jerome with Jerome himself: Jerome used regnal years and so separates deaths and accessions into two distinct regnal years as described above; Prosper uses consuls and so combines those same events within a single consular year.

<sup>64</sup> The frequent and detailed historical entries in the *Consularia Vindobonensia* only begin in 379, which suggests that, in the original text that lies at the base of its several extant forms, these consularia were conceived as continuing Jerome, although Jerome was never transmitted as part of the text, nor was the lengthy list of consuls before 379 ever removed. Nevertheless, the textual archaeology at which we shall be looking in Volume II shows that the inception date of 379 was not original to the Ur-text of the consularia (the *Consularia Italica*), of which the *Consularia Vindobonensia* is a late recension, and that whatever historical entries may have existed before 379 were removed (with a few exceptions).

A number of other characteristics, not all of them having to do with structure, distinguish consularia from chronicles. One of their important features is the constant (though not ubiquitous) appearance of exact day and month dates and the frequent use of 'His cons' or 'Hoc cons', the Latin equivalent of 'During this year ...', to introduce the entries of each year and the use of 'et', '(et) ipso anno', or 'eo anno' ('and', '(and) in the same year', 'in this year') to link entries within a year. Chroniclers, even when using consularia as sources, usually chose to rewrite their information rather than present it that baldly; when doing so, they usually chose to ignore any day dates that they found in these sources. Hydatius and Marcellinus are unusual in how frequently they preserve day and month dates from their consularia sources. Hydatius even adds such information to his own material, drawing on supplemental sources and his own eyewitness testimony, and often noting the day of the week on which an event took place, which he seems to have calculated himself. That, however, is most unusual, for this degree of precision in dating is very much more a feature of consularia than it is of chronicles.

Content is another point of distinction. Surviving examples of consularia demonstrate a particular interest in recent and contemporary events, often disclosed by evidence for ongoing, contemporary compilation, which is exactly what medievalists find in the type of work they call 'annals'. In the case of the *Descriptio consulum*, for example, we have a consular list that covers the years 509 BC to AD 468, the most complete consular list to survive from antiquity after that of Cassiodorus, yet in it there are only three large blocks of material that derive from the activity of contemporary compilers: 286 to 337, 356 to 370, and 375 to 389. Apart from a block of material relating mostly to late republican literature from 112 to 18 BC, and sporadic evidence for an interest in early Christianity and martyrs from 2 BC to AD 258, there was no attempt to annotate the remainder of the consular list to make it look more like a typical chronicle.<sup>65</sup> The same is true, as far as we can tell, for the fragmentary *Consularia Italica*, whose entries now cover only the years between 379 and 493, even though the consular list once extended back further than the currently preserved c. 48 BC, perhaps as far as 509 BC. Later versions were continued contemporaneously by owners and readers down to 539 and c. 575. All this suggests that the owners of consularia were most interested in the consular list itself and the accounts of recent events; they were happy to include those bits of non-contemporary information that appealed to antiquarian or historical interest — the death of Vergil, the birth of Christ — but these things were not essential. Nonetheless, even in those parts of our extant consularia that show clear signs of

<sup>65</sup> The *Descriptio* is analysed in Volume II.

contemporary compilation we find many years in which nothing is reported.<sup>66</sup> It was the list that mattered.

Late antique chronicles, by contrast, always included historical content where they could. For the period before the fifth century, this historical prolegomenon was most conveniently available from Jerome, with its historical account back to the birth of Abraham, so that contemporary chronicles always began with Jerome or an epitome of Jerome. In some compilations, such as Prosper's epitome, additions to Jerome could take the narrative back as far as Creation or Adam.

This dependence on Jerome brings up another important point. In spite of the fact that Mommsen edited these chronicles independently, not a single late antique chronicle was written or transmitted in this way: every chronicle either was written as a continuation of an earlier chronicle that went back to Creation or Abraham, or alternatively began its own narrative that far back in time. It is not until the Carolingian period that we find independent chronicles starting at any other later date (usually the late seventh or early eighth century with the rise of the Carolingians). Yet just as Mommsen did, editors of medieval chronicles often ignore the early derivative material, which still often came from Jerome or Prosper, and only begin their editions where contemporary or original content starts, giving a false impression of the actual starting points of these works.

In another contrast between consularia and chronicle, most chroniclers tried to maintain a year-by-year account of the contemporary record and avoid large gaps whenever possible. This is another tradition that goes back to Jerome, who filled in many of the gaps he found in Eusebius, adding in particular many entries on Roman political, military, and literary history from other sources. The result is that there are no major gaps in Eusebius-Jerome for five hundred years between the first century BC and the fourth century AD, though before that annual details were harder to come by and before the early sixth century AD the text is mostly empty regnal years that simply could not be filled, like the gaps in the Parian Marble noted above. As this contrast suggests, consularia were not generally compiled by or for people with an interest in a complete historical record going back to the foundation of the city

<sup>66</sup> Thus from 284 in the *Descriptio consulum* no entries appear in the years 287–90, 292–93, 296, 298, 300–01, 305, 309, 313, 315, 319–23, 327–29, 331, 336, 338–39, 343–47, 349, 352, 362, and 371–74. Before 284 and from 389 to the end in 468 there is only a handful of further entries, clustered around periods of contemporary compilation or in blocks copied from other sources. The lack of a single complete witness to the Consularia Italica tradition makes it difficult to judge where actual gaps exist, but only a few entries survive from before 379 (see note 64 above), there seems to be a lull in compilation during the 430s and 440s, and after 493 there are no common entries in the surviving traditions.

or empire, let alone the Assyrian or Greek kings or the creation of the world. As we shall see in Chapter 4, compilers were satisfied with collecting and copying easily obtainable imperial proclamations and sought out only a few other sources. Those with an interest in earlier history could include the names of the seven kings of Rome, as do the *Consularia Vindobonensia*, but little beyond that was ever contemplated. With the exception of Cassiodorus, there were few attempts to extend the narrative of consularia back beyond the first-compiled entries in the text tradition as it came into compilers' hands, and certainly not to the foundation of Rome or earlier. Chronicle writers did a great deal more research and used many different sources for both contemporary and ancient history. Prosper even went so far as to add new material to his epitome of Jerome (from consularia), a very unusual level of historical concern.

The contrast in genres is illustrated by the exceptional case of Cassiodorus. When he was chosen to make the traditional presentation of *fasti* to Eutharic for the latter's consulship in 519, he decided to offer the new consul consularia instead. In spite of the restrictions of the genre he felt strongly that it should in some way offer the Gothic consul an overview of Roman history and Rome's place in world history. He began therefore with the creation of the world, as a chronicler would, but in a single paragraph reached Jerome's first Assyrian king. His consular list began after fewer than one hundred further short lines of text: in under forty entries he listed the Assyrian kings with a few historical highlights, and then moved on to the Latin kings, and finally to the Roman kings. Down to this point, Cassiodorus's text is even more compressed than later epitomes like Isidore's. He wanted the shortest possible link between Creation and the first consuls, and had only Eusebius-Jerome, who began with the Assyrian king Ninus, as his guide. He then sprinkled his consular list with random highlights from Roman history culled from an epitome of Livy (the source of his consular list to 9 BC) and from Jerome's chronicle. The small scale of his work is revealed by a comparison: Prosper's epitome of Jerome down to 378 takes up seventy-six pages in Mommsen's MGH edition, while the *Gallic Chronicle of 511*, probably an epitome of an epitome, takes up fully thirteen pages. Cassiodorus's entire text down to 519, by contrast, is thirty-two pages long and that includes almost one thousand pairs of consuls. His historical entries, from start to finish, written in the form of consularia entries, would fill only a couple of pages: appearing very infrequently from the first consuls, they are much more numerous from the beginning of the Roman Empire and increase in frequency again after the death of Constantine. With his inception point set at Creation and his addition of historical entries describing pre-contemporary history, right back to the early republic, Cassiodorus had taken the consularia genre

as close to a chronicle as he could, but he did no more: he was writing consularia not a chronicle. Cassiodorus's efforts to combine the early historical interests of chronicles with the rigid presentation and structure of consularia were unique and took place at the very end of the five-hundred-year-long development of the consularia genre.

The generic distinction between chronicle and consularia that we are here laying out penetrates into the realm of language as well as structure and content. In consularia the entries are always very short, devoid of description and elaboration, and presented in plain, simple, and formulaic language, generally exhibiting a marked preference for perfect passives like *leuatus*, *occisus*, *factus*, *defunctus*, *gestum*, or *ingressus*, often without *est*. No matter what their source of information, compilers of consularia would render their entries in this same form, which was clearly regarded as appropriate to the genre. Chroniclers varied their verb tenses and voices, a sign of the literary pretensions that usually account for their more elaborate description and analysis as well. To put it another way, whereas consularia were compiled, chronicles were composed. This distinction will be analysed in greater detail below, but it is worth pointing out that this is another way in which consularia resemble what most medievalists call 'annals'.

Late Roman chroniclers wrote very briefly in comparison to narrative historians — and even in comparison to later Latin and Greek chroniclers of the high Middle Ages — but they wrote as much as they wished in whatever manner they chose. Their entries are rarely as abrupt or formulaic as those of consularia, though some chroniclers, for instance Marcellinus and Marius, could approach a consularia style when they used consularia as sources early in their chronicles, a sign of their greater reliance on simple compilation than most chroniclers display.<sup>67</sup> For all these reasons, chronicles often reveal a definite authorial 'character' through their selection of evidence and method of composition, and particularly through the explicit comments made by their authors. Consularia, on the other hand, are generally lifeless, even boring, with a limited range of content set forth in a repetitive manner.

That point is well illustrated again by the exceptional case of Cassiodorus. Because we can compare the style of Cassiodorus's otherwise extensive oeuvre with that of his consularia and with the styles of three of his main sources, Livy, Jerome, and Prosper, which are independently extant, we can see how close his work stands to consularia. A comparison with his sources makes it clear that if his consularia had survived anonymously, we would not have been able to attribute them to

<sup>67</sup> Because of his failure to recognize consularia as a separate genre, Croke misses this aspect of Marcellinus's methodology and style.



Cassiodorus on the basis of stylistic or literary analysis: his composition conformed to the rules of his genre, both when he copied his sources (refusing for the most part to rewrite them except to condense) and when he entered material on his own account. Everything mirrors the short, factual entries of consularia, not those of chronicles. Cassiodorus's consularia demonstrate that the style and content of consularia (and chronicles as well) were a function of generic characteristics and not the skill or intelligence — or lack thereof — of the author or compiler, a fundamentally important fact. One could hardly find a more educated or literate man in Ostrogothic Italy than Cassiodorus.

That generic characteristic explains why someone tried to spice up the entries of the *Consularia Hafniensia* between 475 and 487, revising them so that they read more like chronicle or narrative texts.<sup>68</sup> The author of the second part of the *Anonymus Valesianus* did the same thing with his consularia source (a version of the *Consularia Italica*), to the point that the underlying consularia are only just visible. Yet it is worth noting that the reverse of this situation could exist as well, that is, the rendering of chronicle down into consularia style. A contemporary, perhaps eye-witness, account of the confrontation between Odoacar and Theoderic from 489 to 491 first appeared in the *Consularia Italica* tradition as a lengthy and detailed report, quite long for a chronicle, let alone consularia. When an important witness to that tradition, the original recension of the *Consularia Vindobonensia*, was put together, its compiler was forced by his sense of genre boundaries to reduce and rewrite this material so that it read more like the earlier consularia entries in his text. In other words, the compiler tried to harmonize an anomalously full account with the stylistic brevity required by the consularia genre.<sup>69</sup>

Some examples will make a number of these stylistic differences clear. Below we offer several quotations from consularia texts, followed by quotations from chronicles. The first block offers a comparison of texts composed over a period of about 350 years, yet apart from the style of reporting the consular names (which in each case reflects widespread contemporary practices), only the variation of a single verb distinguishes the first- and second-century texts from the fourth- and fifth-century ones:

C. Manlius Valens, C. Antistius Vetus. XIII k. Oct. Domitianus occisus. Eodem die M. Cocceius Nerua imperator appellatus est.

<sup>68</sup> This is the text that Mommsen called the *Additamenta ad Prosperum Havniensia*, *Auctuarium Prosperi Havniense*, and *Continuatio Havniensis Prosperi*.

<sup>69</sup> For all the above-mentioned texts, see Mommsen 1892: 306–13 and 316–21 and, eventually, Volume II of *Mosaics of Time*.

Cum patre <Commodus> appellatus imperator V kal. Exsuperatorias Pollione II et Apro II consulibus.

Arbitione et Lolliano. Leuatus est Iulianus caesar die VIII idus Nouember.

Seuerino et Dagalaifo. Maiorianus [...] occisus est ad fluuium Ira VII idus Aug. et leuatus est imperator dominus noster Seuerus XIII kal. Decembr.<sup>70</sup>

With these we can compare examples from chronicles:

Nerua morbo perit in hortis Sallustianis anno aetatis LXXII, cum iam Traianum adoptasset in filium. Traianus Agrippinae in Galliis imperator factus natus Italicae in Hispania. (Jerome)

Iouianus cruditate siue odore prunarum, quas nimias adoleri iusserat, Dadastanae moritur anno aetatis XXXIII. Post quem Valentinianus tribunus scutariorum e Pannonia Cibaelensis apud Nicaeam Augustus appellatus fratrem Valentem Constantinopoli in communionem regni adsumit. (Jerome)

Theodosio imperatore defuncto et Chrysafio praeposito, qui amicitia principis male usus fuerat, interempto Marcianus consensione totius exercitus suscepit regnum, uir grauissimus et non solum rei publicae, sed etiam ecclesiae pernecessarius. (Prosper)

Gratianus paruulum fratrem habens regni consortem probatae aetatis uirum Theodosium in societatem regni asciscit. (*Gall. Chron.* 452)

Maiorianum de Galliis Romam redeuntem et Romano imperio uel nomine res necessarias ordinantem Rechimer liuore percitus et inuidorum consilio fultus fraude interfecit circumuentum. Romanorum XLV Seuerus a senatu Romae augustus appellatur anno imperii Leonis quinto. (Hydatius)

This is not to say that chroniclers could not be as brief as the compilers of consularia. Jerome has 'Gallienus Mediolanii occiditur'; Prosper, 'Honorius moritur'; the *Gallic Chronicle*, 'Valentinianus Romae imperator factus'; and Hydatius, 'Honorius actis tricennalibus suis Rauenna obiit'. But consularia simply *never* have entries like the chronicle examples above. In consularia there is never a context, an explanation, or an authorial comment, as we see in the chronicle excerpts. We have the 'facts' of the matter and that is all.

The relative brevity or length of entries in consularia has often been taken to reflect the relative importance an entry held for the compiler, but that is a misconception. The mere fact of inclusion signalled an item's importance. The length of an entry was determined by its content, not its importance. We may take just two

<sup>70</sup> The attributions have been left off these quotations to prove another point: the inherent similarities between early imperial consularia preserved on stone and late antique consularia preserved on vellum.

examples, one early and epigraphic, the other late and from a manuscript. In the *Fasti Ostienses*, Nerva's accession in 96 receives two lines of text; the details of Trajan's dedications and triumphal *ludi* in 109 take up eight full lines, while Trajan's many other related games are accorded similar space and detail. Similarly, in the *Descriptio consulum*, the dedication of a cistern in 369 takes up three and a half lines, whereas the accession of Valentinian I in 364 uses just over one line. No one could argue that Trajan's games or the building of a cistern was more important than an imperial accession, and no contemporary compiler, even a very dim one, could have thought so either. It is merely that an accession was a simple matter to record, requiring no more than a single line; the construction of a cistern and the naming of the prefect who oversaw its construction necessarily used up more space. The relative length of a consularia entry, therefore, did not signal its relative importance. The same principle holds true for chronicles, though to a lesser degree.

The point is an important one. Modern scholars — assuming on the model of classicizing history that significance is measured by space and detail — have often criticized chroniclers for their lack of 'balance' or sensible historical perspective: trivial events are mentioned, important events are ignored.<sup>71</sup> However, since chroniclers measured significance by the same criterion of inclusion as did the compilers of consularia, such modern criticisms are clearly misplaced. We should take chroniclers on the same terms, if only because most of them faced the same basic problem as did compilers of consularia: they could only record what they knew personally or what they found in their sources, and many of them were badly placed on both counts. A chronicler might have believed that the Hunnic invasion of Gaul, for instance, was important and merited inclusion, but if he did not know anything about it he could not say anything about it, however important it was. That limit holds true of classicizing historians as well as chroniclers, but the chronicle and consularia genres imposed further limitations: if a chronicler did not know the date of an event, no matter how many details he knew about it, he could say nothing at all about it, because everything he wrote had to be placed under a specific year. He might, perhaps, slip a reference into a general description or overview headed by an expression such as 'His temporibus', but that was all: such is the tyranny of the annalistic structure, whether for a compiler of consularia or a chronicler.

<sup>71</sup> See, for example, Croke 2001a: 260–61, concerning Marcellinus's omission of the Hunnic invasion of Gaul in 451 (not 452 as Croke states). Marcellinus does not mention it because it was not in his western source, which only mentioned the sack of Aquileia in 452 (see Volume II). This problem is dealt with particularly well by White 1987: 7, 9–11, who discusses the absence of the battle of Tours from the *Annals of St Gall*.

The question of inclusion and ‘balance’ leads us to a consideration of sources, and here too consularia and chronicles differ from one another. For the most part, compilers of contemporary consularia relied upon a single source, the empire-wide dissemination of the official promulgation of imperial events and anniversaries. Across the empire, most important events were proclaimed with long speeches and sometimes even feasts, festivals, and holidays, but short forms, intended for public posting and inclusion in calendars and *ferialia* (lists of festivals with their dates), were also officially disseminated. These short notices explain the consistent formulaic language of consularia and calendars, and also their inclusion of day dates. Because they relied upon these imperial sources, consularia tend to concentrate upon emperors and their activities: accessions, births, deaths, *aduentus*, anniversaries, and victories, anything that the imperial government proclaimed publicly for one-time or annual commemoration. Foreign peoples rarely appear except in defeat, and Romans apart from the imperial family only appear in connection with it or its actions. The early imperial forerunners of the consularia genre were very public documents and explicitly pro-imperial. Because compilers continued to rely on imperial sources even in the later empire, that pro-imperial bias survived: the subject matter almost always reflects positively on the emperor and his deeds, by both including the good and omitting the bad. Thus, although the bald, unadorned style of consularia may suggest objective reporting, they are in fact anything but objective, instead reflecting a view of the emperor very much as promulgated by the emperor himself.

The precise means by which emperors disseminated news about themselves is a matter of some controversy, largely because we know so little about it. We can tell from the traces they have left in the extant record that imperial news and commemoration announcements — whether issued at Rome, Ravenna, Constantinople, or elsewhere — were all disseminated in a virtually identical form, like a modern press release. Just as the names of the consuls and imperial legislation were conveyed to all the empire’s cities and towns, so from the time of Augustus the emperors developed a system for disseminating such news as they wished their subjects to commemorate.<sup>72</sup> Unfortunately, the actual process by which the central authority proclaimed and disseminated its news across the empire is obscure to us, as is how and where such proclamations were recorded and posted after being announced. But we can be sure that the system worked as it was meant to, because the individuals who compiled our extant sources recorded their information in a very similar form, no matter where in the empire they were writing. They might change words or leave phrases or sentences out, but the structure and vocabulary

<sup>72</sup> This will be discussed in detail in Chapter 4.

of their records remained very much the same. As a result, a notice about Theodosius's *aduentus* into Rome in 389 can appear in a similar form and with nearly identical vocabulary in a very diverse set of sources: the *Descriptio consulum*, the *Consularia Vindobonensia priora*, Marcellinus *comes*, the *Chronicon Paschale*, Theophanes, and perhaps even the *Consularia Golenischevensis*, some of which are only distantly related to one another, and others wholly unrelated.<sup>73</sup>

Although consularia are for the most part made up of this imperial information, they also, like many chronicles, can betray a local focus that parallels the larger imperial one. This local focus is usually expressed through reports of plagues, earthquakes, comets, auroras, and other types of natural phenomena that were regarded as unusual or as signs or portents. Compilers added such notices themselves, often in great number, and usually from personal knowledge. They had various motives in doing so, not least an interest in the phenomena for their own sake, though perhaps more important as signs which might foretell — or might already have foretold — the outcome of events that related to the emperor or empire.<sup>74</sup> More important, natural (or supernatural) phenomena were also useful chronological aids, inasmuch as striking celestial or terrestrial events would be remembered by readers and used by them as markers to which historical events in the text could be related. For that reason, consularia produced in Rome would make reference to Roman events, those from Constantinople to events in Constantinople, and so on.<sup>75</sup> As a result, consularia were eclectic compendia of the deeds of

<sup>73</sup> Thus although Marcellinus and the *Consularia Vindobonensia priora* are distantly related through the *Consularia Italica*, Marcellinus's entry is actually closer verbally to the *Descriptio*, to which it is not in any way related at this point. The two Greek versions share obvious similarities with the Latin versions but also share their own similarity, a common error from a different source: the fact that Honorius was made emperor in Rome in 389. Furthermore, Marcellinus includes the largesse otherwise mentioned only by the *Descriptio* and the departure mentioned only by the *Consularia Vindobonensia priora* and Theophanes. These texts are quoted in full in 'Chapter 1, note 73' in the Appendices to the Footnotes, p. 361 below.

<sup>74</sup> The *Excerpta Sangallensia*, analysed in Volume II, is in fact nothing more than a collection of such notes, excerpted from a version of the original *Consularia Vindobonensia priora*.

<sup>75</sup> The consularia from Constantinople that survive or can be reconstructed admit other types of information that relate specifically to the city itself, such as the construction, dedication, or destruction of such things as churches, baths, cisterns, and porticoes, as well as fires and civil unrest. This type of information never appears in the known Western documents, except for a note on the destruction of monuments by fire in Ravenna in 455 and 488. Some of this information may derive from local proclamations made at the time of dedications. Other entries probably reflect the compiler's desire to commemorate the erection of important local buildings or tragic events that

the emperor, peppered liberally with references to unusual natural phenomena and miscellaneous urban information.

The same sort of information as that described in the above paragraphs is, of course, the bulk of what we find in chronicles as well, though it is fleshed out with considerably greater variety and far more diverse commentary from its authors than we find in consularia. Indeed, it is the case that unusual natural phenomena in particular are such a regular part of every chronicle tradition from the Assyrians to the Middle Ages that one might even be tempted, like Gervase (see note 39), to include such reports as a defining aspect of the genre.

One distinction between consularia and chronicles is more apparent than real, however, and that is the scope of the religious information they include. Although chronicles are generally regarded as a Christian genre in a way that consularia are not, that is not in fact the case, as we shall see below. Both consularia and chronicles do, however, stand in contrast to classicizing history in this respect, even classicizing histories written by Christians. The distinctly secular focus of committed, even polemical, pagans like Ammianus and Eunapius needs no comment, but Greek classicizing historians of the fifth and sixth centuries avoid religion even when, like Procopius, they were Christians themselves.<sup>76</sup> Religious history, which from the fourth century meant ecclesiastical history, developed its own historical canon, listing successive bishops, patriarchs, and popes and recounting their exploits and activities, describing councils, important ecclesiastics and their writings, and heretical beliefs, their leaders and adherents. Some Christian chroniclers show the same level of interest in these matters as ecclesiastical historians like Eusebius, Socrates, or Theodoret, and the Church can play a more important part in some of these chronicles than the emperor and his political affairs. In some ways, bishops and emperors could be seen as the protagonists of parallel narratives, orthodoxy struggling against heresy on the one hand, imperial power struggling against usurpers and barbarians on the other. This new suitability of ecclesiastical affairs as a subject for history might be thought to derive from Eusebius's *Historia ecclesiastica*, translated into Latin by Rufinus at the beginning of the fifth century, and of Sulpicius Severus's *Chronica*, written in Gaul soon after 400, but it owes just as much to the influence of Eusebius's *Chronici canones*, in Jerome's translation and decidedly

he or his readers would find interesting. Then as now the reading public was interested in death and disaster: fires, riots, and the collapse of important local buildings.

<sup>76</sup> We shall not here enter into the debate over the extent to which Platonic, rather than Christian, belief determined Procopius's views on and presentation of history, but see now the challenging approach of Kaldellis 2004.

anti-Arian continuation.<sup>77</sup> Prosper in particular followed Jerome's interest in heresy-busting, especially on the part of the pope.

Late Roman consularia, however, follow the generic parameters of their early imperial precursors and so never exhibit this major interest of the chroniclers. As a result, they look superficially very secular by comparison. But this is an illusion. It so happens that the earliest surviving manuscript — as opposed to epigraphic — consularia for which we still have any evidence were simple fasti to which a few Christian additions had been made: the birth and death of Christ, the deaths of Peter and Paul, early martyrdoms, and persecutions.<sup>78</sup> These notices were intended to place the development of Christianity, and the important events in early Christian history, into an easily datable Roman context. We must not forget that, after Constantine, Christians regarded the empire as being Christian; indeed many believed that it was by God's Providence that the empire had been created, so that Christ could be born into a unified Mediterranean world and his good news spread throughout it. Nowhere is this idea better demonstrated than in Eusebius's chronicle, in which the columns that record the histories of eighteen Mediterranean kingdoms are slowly reduced from as many as nine columns on a double-page spread to a single, page-wide column representing the Roman Empire: polyarchy reduced to monarchy for the transition from polytheism to monotheism through the spread of the Christian gospel.<sup>79</sup> In reporting the birth and death of Christ, the deaths of martyrs and saints, and in the East the translation of relics and the construction of important churches, the consularia *are* Christian. It is simply that they do not narrate ecclesiastical history, which was by tradition not considered to belong to the genre. By the time of the *Descriptio consulum*, contemporary compilers in Constantinople included a number of what we would consider 'Christian' events, the translation of relics and the dedication of churches, but they did so as normal civic events, judging them worthy of inclusion by the same criteria as other

<sup>77</sup> Severus's work is not a chronicle in any real sense of the word (see, e.g., Cardelle de Hartmann 2000: 127), but rather a *breviarium* of ecclesiastical history, starting with an epitome of the Old Testament in the first book and growing more detailed when treating the Arian and Priscilianist struggles of the fourth century in the second book.

<sup>78</sup> Evidence for these early, Christian 'proto-consularia' can be found in the fasti of the *Chronograph of 354*. Similar, though more numerous, entries can be found in the *Consularia Vindobonensia* and *Descriptio consulum* (from a common source), as well as in the common fasti that lie behind the *Consularia Vindobonensia*, the *Consularia Scaligeriana*, and Prosper (from another common source): see Burgess 2003: 24–28 and Volume II.

<sup>79</sup> The expression is that of Chesnut 1986: 77.

civic events that we would call secular, such as the arrival of the emperor's body for burial or the construction of a new cistern.

That general rule having been stated, we should note two interesting violations of it. The first is the *Consularia Scaligeriana*, which is, as can be seen from Burgess (forthcoming) and Volume II, a Latin translation of a Greek translation of perfectly normal Latin consularia that derive from the tradition of the *Consularia Vindobonensia*. In the first half of the text, the *Consularia Scaligeriana* includes a bizarrely dated narrative based on the New Testament and the popular apocryphon, the *Protevangelium Iacobi*, which extends from the angel's annunciation of John's birth to Zachariah in the Temple (§ 45, dated to 18 BC but placed under the consuls of 24/23 BC) to the 'ordination' of Paul as an apostle in AD 31 (§ 121; the martyrdoms of Peter and Paul in § 149 are expansions of an entry in the underlying *fasti*). In the second half of the text, it includes a partial succession of Alexandrian bishops from Peter to Theophilus (§§ 197, 228, 258, 300, 313, 325) as well as other Christian matters such as persecution (§§ 197, 202, 258, 286), the discovery of wood from the true cross (§ 219), and the council of Nicaea (§ 224). However, the *Consularia Scaligeriana* was compiled in Alexandria as part of a much larger chronographic text, the *Chronographia Scaligeriana*, which included the *Συναγωγή χρόνων*/*Liber generationis* and many long excerpts from Julius Africanus's *Chronographiae* (both described in Chapter 3), among many others. The original Greek version of this compilation was put together during the reign of Justinian (527–65) and the extant Latin manuscript (Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, MS lat. 4884) dates to the 780s (see Burgess forthcoming). Because of its obvious Greek — in fact Alexandrian — origins and the absence of all the above Christian material from the Latin original, this Christian material was certainly added to the Latin text at the time it was translated into Greek or soon thereafter, during the second quarter of the sixth century. In its inclusion of this Christian material, the *Consularia Scaligeriana*, as a Latin text, is therefore unique, as a result of its later Greek reworking. The closely related *Consularia Golenischevensia*, which derives from the same Alexandrian tradition as the *Consularia Scaligeriana* and still survives in its original Greek form, also includes two such religious notes, one on the death of Timothy and the ordination of Theophilus and the other on the destruction of the Serapeum (Bauer and Strzygowski 1905: 74). All told, then, the *Consularia Scaligeriana* and *Consularia Golenischevensia* are very much *sui generis*, in terms of the nature of their text, their place of origin, and their date, so anomalous that we should not use them to infer anything about earlier western texts.

Among the western texts themselves, the only partial exception to the total exclusion of Christian material in consularia comes in the *Descriptio consulum*. Towards the end of our recension of the *Descriptio* is a short section that was composed in



Carthage between 399 and 405 (see Volume II). During this period four entries were added: the destruction of pagan temples by two imperial officials (*s.a.* 399), an eclipse (402), a 'civil war' (404), and unity between Catholics and Donatists (405).<sup>80</sup> The first and last are obviously religious and ecclesiastical entries, the latter referring the *Edictum de unitate* (Unity Edict) of Honorius, drafted on 12 February and promulgated in Carthage on 26 June 405, which branded Donatism as a heresy and ordered that it be 'disbanded'. The civil war, 'bellum ciuile fuit ex III kl. September [*sic*]', seems to be a reference not to any military activity (for none is known in Africa at the time) but to the escalating violence taking place in North Africa between Donatists and the orthodox in the lead up to the promulgation of the Unity Edict. But, again, we find these few additions to these consularia to have been made in a remote location, far from the origins of our other surviving texts. Yet even in this uncharacteristic section, genre still exerts its controlling force, since the style of these entries is indistinguishable from the other reports of official promulgations. That is to say, in this unique occasion when ecclesiastical history was added to the consularia, it was made to conform to the brevity and dating style imposed by the genre itself. The same is true of the other notes on early Christian history and martyrs and their relics: every entry was recast into the generically acceptable style, even though it did not derive from an imperial proclamation.

Two other general characteristics of consularia that set them apart from chronicles remain to be considered. For reasons that have not yet been adequately explained, editions of consularia were often produced with occasional, stereotyped drawings illustrating particular entries. Two illustrated consularia and two illustrated chronological compendia survive.<sup>81</sup> Illustrated consularia parallel other utilitarian documents of the period, not least the various official and semi-official lists found in the manuscripts of the *Notitia dignitatum*, the *Chronograph of 354*, and the *Laterculus* of Polemius Silvius. This is yet another sign that consularia were chiefly thought of as utilitarian or scientific documents, not literary works. As far as we know, no chronicle was ever illustrated.

<sup>80</sup> The destruction of the pagan temples was in Carthage, as we learn from a parallel entry (not written in consularia style) quoted by Augustine from a local chronicle in *De ciuitate dei* (18. 54). See the commentary in Volume II. The eclipse of 402 was total in Carthage.

<sup>81</sup> They are the *Consularia Berolinensia*, *Consularia Marsiburgensia*, *Chronographia Scaligeriana* (in which the illustrations do not survive, but the spaces for them, and in some cases the captions, do), and *Chronographia Golenischeuensis*. The latter two are chronological compendia. On these illustrated texts, see Muhlberger 1990: 38–40, Burgess and Dijkstra 2012, Bischoff and Koehler 1939: 129–38, Burgess forthcoming, Bauer and Strzygowski 1905, Burgess and Dijkstra forthcoming, and Weitzmann 1971, esp. pp. 121–25.

A final characteristic of general significance is the anonymous authorship of all the surviving examples of pure consularia. They are, in fact, anonymous in two senses of the word, both insofar as no author's name is attached to them and in that we can detect nothing about their authorship using literary or stylistic analysis. On the other hand, we can often say something about a chronicler's outlook and interests, his biases and predilections, his politics and theology. Chroniclers exist within their texts as narrators, and their characteristics often show through; with few exceptions the compilers of consularia do not, except as selectors of information. The compilers of consularia almost never make any intrusions into the narrative; they offer no descriptions, no explanations, no judgements, only a factual record of what happened, expressed plainly and simply in formulaic language. This pattern is seen first in the epigraphic consularia and calendars of the early empire, and it carries right through into the sixth century. As a result, the compilers of these works are completely invisible to us except through the material they selected for inclusion. But even that tells us far less than it might. Consularia were compiled over many years, and the texts as they have come down to us had many compilers and editors, extending into the sixth century. Under such circumstances a single selection process can hardly be uncovered. Worse, almost all extant consularia are fragmentary — as would be expected given their 'scientific' status as handbooks not proper literary texts — so omissions can rarely be detected with certainty.<sup>82</sup> In spite of all this, the occasional authorial touch can slip in. The *Descriptio consulum* preserves two authorial intrusions, where a compiler or copyist, whoever he was and whenever he wrote, could not restrain himself from commenting on the death of Julian and the accession of Jovian in 363: 'et quia apostata a deo factus est, Christianorum etiam persecutor occisus est', while Jovian is described as 'christianissimus Iouianus'.<sup>83</sup> That type of comment is typical, indeed commonplace, in chronicles, but this example from the *Descriptio* is unique in pure consularia.<sup>84</sup>

<sup>82</sup> We can compare this with the manuscript traditions of the *Chronograph of 354*, which are similarly corrupt and fragmentary: see Mommsen 1892: 17–34, Salzman 1990: 249–68, and Burgess 2012.

<sup>83</sup> 'Since he had become an apostate from God, a persecutor of the Christians was killed as well'. We may assume that comments on the usurper Procopius in 365 and 366 are those of the compiler's original official source.

<sup>84</sup> It should be noted that the compiler responsible for these comments probably lived in Constantinople, whereas the compiler responsible for the ecclesiastical material discussed above was in Africa.

It is in this respect of authorial presence that consularia differ most from chronicles. As we have just seen at some length, consularia allow us almost no glimpse of their authors; the constraints of the genre are rigid. This is even true for Cassiodorus: his consularia are the sole example that has come down to us with a name attached to it. But without that name and the reference to his consulship (§ 1356) there is nothing that would associate it with Cassiodorus. And even though we know that Cassiodorus compiled it and under what circumstances he did so, it is still difficult to relate the work and its contents in any meaningful way to those circumstances. So even with his name, it is still very much an anonymous work. So much so, in fact, that had Cassiodorus's name not survived along with his text, we may be certain that his authorship would be vigorously denied by most scholars.

Chronicles, on the other hand, allowed for authorial intrusion and comment, even as they lacked the ample internal narrative of regular classicizing histories. Chroniclers could provide descriptions, make judgements, explain causality, and offer comments on people and events, if only in the form of an adjective or adverb. The result is that something of a chronicler's biases and interests, and at times even something of his character, can be determined from his words. And because chronicles are for the most part the unaltered and usually complete work of a single author, something of him can also be extracted from the work on the basis of his method of selection. This is the case even where the author's name has not come down to us, which is why studies have been written not just on Hydatius, Prosper, and Marcellinus, but also on the anonymous authors of the *Gallic Chronicle of 452* and even the last part of the *Hafniensia*.<sup>85</sup> There can be no such study of the 'author' of the *Descriptio consulum* or the *Consularia Italica* for these works had no authors in any meaningful sense, only a sequence of compilers. Once again, this distinction between consularia and chronicle is reminiscent of that which medievalists draw between their 'annals' and 'chronicles'.

The spartan nature of consularia is also relevant to their transmission history. Their simple, formulaic style and content almost begged to be improved and augmented, and their anonymity encouraged such improvements. Because of their subliterate nature, they tended to be copied not in lavish presentation codices but in cheap, quickly produced, illustrated editions. Such production methods increased the availability and circulation of these works, but necessarily corrupted their textual traditions. The massive corruption of the consular lists available after the middle of the second century AD if not before — demonstrable from the

<sup>85</sup> Muhlberger 1990, Croke 2001a, and Muhlberger 1984a.

common errors in the different independent fasti that have come down to us — shows that most extant fasti descended from just this type of sloppily produced edition.<sup>86</sup> The frequent discrepancies among different consularia texts in the content and dating of information arise from the same cause.

Because consularia were seen as practical guides or antiquarian handbooks, rather than as integral literary works, it is not surprising that few have survived intact, or in more than a single manuscript copy. Most consularia were used as sources for chronicles and themselves no longer survive: the only two that survive in something approaching their original state are the *Descriptio* and the fragmentary *Consularia Marsiburgensia*.<sup>87</sup> Most others were augmented, rewritten, or otherwise tampered with to create hybrid chronological documents, exhibiting features of both consularia and chronicles. The *Consularia Vindobonensia priora* and *posteriora* and the *Excerpta Sangallensia*, three lists that all derive from a common archetype, are fragmentary and the latter is, as its modern title suggests, just excerpts; the *Consularia Vindobonensia posteriora* has been heavily, and rather carelessly, reworked. The *Paschale Campanum* (consularia added to an Easter table) and the chronicle of Marius of Avenches from 455 to c. 527 retain within them historical entries identical in style and structure to those of their consularia sources, while the extant *Consularia Hafniensia* retains the impress of failed attempts to expand the dry consularia entries into a chronicle-style document, as mentioned above. Reworked consularia are also evident among the sources of the chronicle of Marcellinus comes, the earlier portion of the *Anonymus Valesianus* (*pars posterior*), the western material in the *Chronographia* of Theophanes, and sections of the *Liber pontificalis ecclesiae Rauennatis* of Andreas Agnellus. Excerpts from the sixth-century *Consularia Caesaraugustana*, the last-known Latin consularia, survived only in the margins of copies of a now-lost sixteenth-century manuscript of the chronicles of Victor of Tunnuna and John of Bictar.<sup>88</sup>

Fewer such works survive in Greek and all that do have Latin roots. The fragmentary *Consularia Berolinensia* represents a reasonably pure consularia tradition and descends from Greek translations of the *Descriptio consulum* and the fasti that underlie the *Consularia Vindobonensia* and the chronicle of Prosper. Because it was found in Egypt (it is written on parchment, not papyrus) the *Consularia*

<sup>86</sup> Burgess 2000.

<sup>87</sup> The latter survives on only a half piece of vellum and covers the years 411–13, 421–23, 427–29, 434–37, 439 (illustration) – 443, and 452–54.

<sup>88</sup> For more details, see Chapter 4 and Volume II.

*Berolinensia* was probably Alexandrian in origin. The *Consularia Scaligeriana* (described above) and the *Consularia Golenischevensia*, both descended from a common Greek translation of the *Consularia Vindobonensia*, are contaminated with many later interpolations and have been inserted into larger chronological works, the *Chronographia Scaligeriana* and *Chronographia Golenischevensis*. They too were compiled in Alexandria.<sup>89</sup> The *Chronicon Paschale*, a Greek chronicle compiled c. 630 in Constantinople, used a Greek translation of the *Descriptio consulum* and also what seems to have been a Constantinopolitan continuation of the *Descriptio* down to 468 that would seem to have been used by Marcellinus comes for his chronicle as well. From these examples we can therefore see that Alexandria had as rich a tradition of consularia as we find in Constantinople, Rome, and Ravenna. As these examples show, from the fourth century onwards, chronicles and consularia influenced one another. Nevertheless, important political changes — first in the West where the last emperor was deposed in 476 and then in the East where the consulship was abolished in 541 — meant that the lifespan of the consularia genre was limited. A necessarily ancien-régime manner of viewing the past, the consularia were no longer of any use by the middle of the sixth century and soon of equally little interest. The chronicle, by contrast, lived on as the dominant historiographical form of the Middle Ages.

However, the impulse to add brief notes to a pre-existing list of dates did not die with the end of the private consulate in 541. An uncommon but important genre of the Middle Ages that we have already mentioned and will discuss again in Chapter 6 is that of Easter-table or paschal chronicles ('annals' to medievalists). Like fasti, these were in origin entirely practical documents, but the listing of dates — consuls, years from the Passion, or years from the Incarnation — and blank spaces in the manuscripts, whether incidental to or deliberate in the copying, attracted the addition of brief historical entries in the same way that fasti had once done. Easter tables thereafter developed into a chronicle subgenre in their own right. The earliest surviving example of these paschal chronicles is the *Paschale Campanum*, written in southern Italy and covering the years 464 to 512.<sup>90</sup> Because it was written before

<sup>89</sup> The consularia source used by Theophanes shows signs of Alexandrian recension as well (see Volume II and Mango and Scott 1997: lxxviii–lxxx).

<sup>90</sup> It was later extended to 560, then to 587, and then to at least 613, where the manuscript breaks off. In general, see Volume II. The existence of this precedent was recognized and pointed out by a medievalist as early as 1943 (Jones 1943: 118 n. 1 and 1947: 9), but few seem to have paid any attention to it, contradicting as it did decades of received opinion which insisted that 'annals' were the invention of the seventh and eighth centuries.

the abolition of the consulship, its major chronology is provided by consuls, down to 543, though years *a passione Christi* were added later and appear for three decades between 476 and 496 (calculated from AD 26) and every year from 504 down to 593 (when the calculation is reckoned from AD 27). The earliest historical entries between 465 and 476 and in 493 were derived from a tradition of the *Consularia Italica* and after that a number of isolated entries detailing a variety of events, some local and contemporary, were added.<sup>91</sup> Apart from the *Paschale Campanum*, the manuscripts of the famous and popular Easter table of Victorius of Aquitaine also contain a few roughly contemporary historical additions of the sixth century, at least one of which predates the entries in the *Paschale Campanum*.<sup>92</sup> Hardly more than a century separates the Kentish ‘annals’ from these Campanian ‘annals’. It would be rash indeed to claim that no other such texts were compiled across Europe or Great Britain in the intervening century. The replacement of older Easter tables that were based on earlier and differing methods of *computus* (especially the Celtic and the Victorian) by the table of Dionysius almost certainly accounts for the dearth of surviving paschal chronicles before the eighth century. There can be little doubt, therefore, that the apparently ‘sudden’ appearance of paschal chronicles (‘annals’) in the seventh and eighth centuries *ex nihilo* is more a result of the widespread and permanent acceptance of the Dionysian table within which they were written than of any historiographical developments.

<sup>91</sup> The later additions appear in the years 478, 484, 491, 493, 496, 502, 505, and 512 (two). The final three entries are certainly the result of contemporary local compilation (two mention eruptions of Vesuvius), but the earlier entries may derive from an otherwise non-extant tradition of the *Consularia Vindobonensia* or *Consularia Italica*. For a translation of the relevant portion of this text, see Appendix 5.1.6 below and Volume II.

<sup>92</sup> MS G (Gotha, Forschungsbibliothek, Memb. I 75) contains a single note under the year 501: ‘Gundubadus fuit in Albinione’ (‘Gundobad [the king of the Burgundians] was in Avignon’). See Mommsen 1892: 729. The existence of this annotation was also pointed out by Krusch 1884: 277 (see next note) and Jones 1943: 118 n. 1, but similarly ignored by most readers. MS S, thought lost by Mommsen and Victorius’s last editor Bruno Krusch, actually survives in the Bodleian Library, Oxford (MS Bodley 309; see Jones 1937), and it too preserves an early, though perhaps not exactly contemporary, addition under 525: ‘Boetius occiditur’ (fol. 119<sup>v</sup>). MS Q (Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, MS lat. 4859) contains the following note under the year 490, ‘Hiss conss Theodoricus rex intrauit Italiam’ (Mommsen’s text, 1892: 727, is incorrect), but contrary to what Mommsen and Krusch believed, this is for the most part a contemporarily compiled consular list that extends from 379 to 558 (now to be called the *Fasti Parisini*) and does not have anything to do with Victorius of Aquitaine or his Easter table, as Michael Klaassen demonstrates in Klaassen 2012, which contains an analysis and complete edition.

In these isolated texts we can see the end of one genre, the consularia, and the rise of another, the paschal chronicle.<sup>93</sup> As was the case with chronicles, in other words, it is clear that the medieval tradition of compiling 'annals' began under the Roman Empire and continued through into the Middle Ages, where the Easter cycle, rather than the now defunct consular list, provided the annalistic framework for annotation. It just so happened that both offered continuous lists of dates, which were perfect receptacles for the preservation of historical jottings. But otherwise there was really little difference between the two genres.

### *Classifying the Extant Works*

The extended analysis of generic differences we have now undertaken allows us to classify the various extant chronological works of late antiquity that we shall treat in this and subsequent volumes, as follows.

Hydatius and the author of the *Gallic Chronicle of 452* wrote pure chronicles, as had Jerome, whom they continued, directly and exactly. Prosper did so as well (from the crucifixion), even though he jettisoned Jerome's regnal years and replaced them with consuls (under the influence of consularia, which he used as a source) and years from the Passion. His epitome of Jerome's chronicle to the crucifixion was quite different from anything that had gone before and provided the inspiration for the later chronicle epitomes of Isidore and Bede. Prosper was followed by Victor of Tunnuna and John of Bictar, who eventually had to abandon the use of consuls they had inherited from Prosper. Where they are not simply *fasti*, the *Descriptio consulum*, *Consularia Vindobonensia*, *Consularia Marsiburgensia*, and *Consularia Berolinensia* are more or less pure consularia.<sup>94</sup> Everything else is to some degree a hybrid. Marcellinus *comes* also wrote a chronicle, but he was heavily influenced by the consularia sources he drew upon and so his chronicle shows many traits of consularia, both in his use of consular dating and in style and content, though only in the early part of his chronicle. Otherwise his work is pure chronicle. He also used Orosius's *Historia contra paganos* as a source and, where he does so, he reproduces Orosius's style and detail. Marius of Avenches was even more heavily influenced by consularia than was Marcellinus; the first part of his continuation of Prosper is simply consularia shorn of their day and month dates,

<sup>93</sup> See Krusch 1884: 277: 'Der Gothanus [G] [...] enthält also zugleich die ersten Anfänge fraenkischer Osterannalen.'

<sup>94</sup> The minor exceptions have been described above.

as was the normal chronicle convention, but the text becomes more like a chronicle in its later sections.<sup>95</sup> The *Consularia Hafniensia* starts out as pure consularia, trimmed to fit as a continuation of Prosper, but the differing versions for the 470s and 480s represent attempts to convert these consularia into something more like a chronicle through expansion and stylistic revision. In addition, the entries for the years 489 to 491 are even more than what we would expect of a chronicle, let alone consularia. Later, this basic text was supplemented with excerpts from Isidore and the *Liber pontificalis*, and had a *breviarium*-style continuation appended to it.<sup>96</sup> It is clear that, as the fifth century progressed, the originally completely separate genres of consularia and chronicle began to influence one another and the boundaries between the genres broke down as writers took useful aspects of one and applied them to the other.

As we noted above, the perfect example of this bending of genres is Cassiodorus's consularia, written at the end of 518. They represent a unique blending of consularia and chronicle. Although it was written primarily as consularia following their generic rules of structure, style, and content, its author is named, it survives complete (because its author was known), it attempts to record a number of interesting historical events before the fifth century, and it begins with an introductory chronicle epitome from the creation of the world down to the expulsion of Tarquinius.<sup>97</sup>

In the chapters that follow, we shall look in considerable detail at the historical development of the two genres we have here been considering, the chronicle and the consularia. Both have long histories, the chronicle's far longer than that of the consularia. The story begins in the Ancient Near East and the pre-Classical Mediterranean, goes on to encompass the whole of the world that the Roman Empire brought under its control, and then — in Latin, Greek, and Syriac — continues beyond the fall of the western empire into the new world of the Middle Ages.

<sup>95</sup> Between 455 and 526, Marius's only sources were consularia, which explains the stylistic peculiarity: see Favrod 1993: 28, 30–31, and 113.

<sup>96</sup> See Volume II.

<sup>97</sup> As Cassiodorus himself says, the main purpose of the work was to produce an accurate list of consuls (see note 58 above).



## Addendum

### *Towards an Ecumenical Vocabulary*

Given the length and complexity of this first chapter, it seems worth summarizing the usage and terminology that we advocate. Our choice of vocabulary will seem eccentric in various ways, but it is carefully chosen to point up the similarities — indeed the direct generic continuities — between and among works written in different cultures across several millennia. Our usage differs in particular from that which is standard among medievalists, for reasons outlined below.

1. *Annals/Annales*. We urge that this term be dropped completely. Romans and early medieval writers used it to refer to ‘histories’ in a general way, regardless of content or format. Gervase of Canterbury, to whom modern medievalists sometimes appeal, used ‘annals’, in error, as a synonym for ‘chronicle’, and it would seem that it is from a misunderstanding of Aulus Gellius, Gervase’s source for his terminology, that the habit of using the words synonymously descends (see Appendix 2). There is no ancient or medieval warrant for the current use of ‘annals’ by medievalists for a historical genre different from chronicles, and the humanist and nineteenth-century precedents for the current usage have sown confusion among medievalists about the origins of medieval historical genres.

2. *Chronicle/Chronica* (neuter plural). We use this term to describe any historical work that meets the following criteria: it is brief, annalistic (i.e. recounts a year-by-year chronology), concerned in some way with chronology, be that annalistic (year-by-year) or absolute, paratactic in its narrative, and extensive in its chronological coverage (i.e. usually aspiring to cover hundreds or thousands of years rather than individual years or decades). Our usage may cause confusion in one particular, which is how to define brevity. At a fundamental level, this cannot be defined with any great precision or with hard and fast rules, any more than the point at which hot water becomes warm or cool water cold. When taken in conjunction with the other characteristics, however, our assessment of what is and what is not a chronicle becomes somewhat easier: Sigebert of Gembloux’s long entries for the years 1006 and 1111, for example, are abnormally extensive by comparison to the brief notices of his earlier years, but when placed beside the space devoted to a single year by a narrative historian like Froissart, even Sigebert’s longest passages can be understood as entries in a chronicle. Similarly, there is no certain means of determining at what point a collection of annually compiled notes (in an Easter table, for instance) becomes a chronicle.

Chronicles of the pre-medieval period tend to extend back to a distant past and attempt to have a wide geographical range (though this is not true of consularia).

This type of chronicle, which can still be found in the Middle Ages, has usually been called a ‘universal chronicle’, and we accept that designation. In the medieval period, however, there developed a stand-alone chronicle that began at a much later, contemporary period, treated the events of each year in more detail, and covered much shorter lengths of time, only decades or hundreds rather than thousands of years. This sort of text has no specific designation, but since it is a late development and is an evolved state of the chronicle, it should be distinguished from the earlier, universal type. We therefore suggest something like ‘developed chronicle’, and this would include the type of chronicle often referred to as ‘imperial annals’, like the *Annales regni Francorum*. Medieval chronicles that present both of these types, a universal chronicle that takes on the characteristics of the developed chronicle (like the chronicles of Frutolf of Michelsberg/Ekkehard of Aura and of Sigebert and its many continuations, for instance), could be called a ‘hybrid chronicle’. Such terminology could also be employed to take account of the inclusion of long stretches of non-annalistic material in what is otherwise an annalistic account, as is the case with Frutolf/Ekkehard. Dunphy (2010a: 282) has suggested other such subgenres as well, such as ‘Franciscan chronicles’, ‘town chronicles’, and ‘family chronicles’, and no doubt many others can be suggested. The main point here is not what precise name we use, but rather that these works all be recognized as chronicles.

3. Consularia. We use this term to designate a specific subset within the larger chronicle genre: annotated consular lists. By comparison to chronicles more generally, consularia were a comparatively short-lived genre, in large part because they were so closely linked to a specifically Roman conception of the past within the framework of a functioning Roman governmental system. Consularia are marked by the use of consuls as the sole basis of chronology, extreme brevity, neutral and formulaic language that arises from the use of imperial notices as the major sources, and an absence of ecclesiastical history (which only applies to the late Roman examples, obviously).

4. Paschal chronicles. We use this term to describe still another subset of the larger chronicle — in a way an offshoot of consularia: those chronicles that were structured by, and written within, the framework of an Easter table. We use this term whether or not the Easter tables have been retained in the later recensions that have been transmitted. Some have called these ‘monastic annals’, but as a genre they have no necessary connection to monasteries.

5. Chronicle epitomes. We use this term to describe the works of Isidore, Bede, and later their continuators, as well as Prosper’s epitome of Jerome to the crucifixion. Under the influence of this epitome, it would seem, Isidore invented and Bede developed an even more compact method of presenting the past than was the

chronicle itself. Chronicle epitomes are marked by extreme brevity, a basic chronological division into reigns rather than years, a concern for absolute rather than relative chronology, and a text that is structured in its early portion around a radical epitome of Jerome's chronicle (and in later examples Isidore or Bede's epitomes), supplemented from other sources and continued down to the time of writing.

6. Chronograph or Chronography. We use this word to describe works that simply combine chronographic lists, particularly regnal lists and episcopal lists. The *Συναγωγή χρόνων/Liber generationis* and the new Leipzig Chronograph are good examples of this as are the many Byzantine examples of such works as the *Χρονογραφεῖον σύντομον*. Annotated chronographs are represented by works such as Julius Africanus's *Χρονογραφίαι*, Eusebius's *Χρονογραφία*, and Syncellus's *Ἐκλογὴ χρονογραφίας*, as well as the first two sections of the *Chronographia Scaligeriana*, which derive from the *Συναγωγή χρόνων/Liber generationis* and Julius Africanus. Syncellus describes this subgenre well when describing his own work: 'μοι πάσα σπουδὴ γέγονε τόδε τὸ χρονικὸν συντάξαι κανονικῶς τε καὶ ἐξηγητικῶς' ('I have made every effort to arrange the chronology presented here with tables and explanations'; *Ecl. chron.*, p. 1. 20–22; trans. by Adler and Tuffin 2002: 1). These 'explanations' are what we mean by 'annotation'. Chronicles, as we define them, do not have regnal-year tables or explanations ('κανονικῶς τε καὶ ἐξηγητικῶς'), and plain chronographs do not have explanations, or at least extensive explanations.

7. *Breviaria* and epitomes. We use these terms in explicit contradistinction to all of the foregoing. They designate a subset of the larger genre of narrative history. Unlike most narrative histories, they are extremely brief and extensive in their chronological coverage (i.e. covering hundreds or even thousands of years rather than decades). Unlike chronicles, they display little or no interest in chronology. Epitomes are a subset of *breviaria* and have for the most part simply been copied from longer and more detailed histories and are therefore just précis of those works. These terms are often used interchangeably since it is usually difficult to know exactly what has been epitomized to create surviving texts when their original sources have been lost. For instance, Aurelius Victor appears to have thoroughly reworked his sources and produced his own *breviarium*, whereas Eutropius seems to have been much less original and so produced more of an epitome of his major source (the now-lost *Kaisergeschichte*). The epitomes and *periochae* of Livy are extant examples of pure epitomes for which at least some of the original survives.

In this category we would include the obvious classical examples — Velleius Paterculus, Florus, the *periochae* of Livy, Aurelius Victor, Eutropius, Festus, and the *Epitome de caesaribus* — as well as most of the later Byzantine works that are

usually now called chronicles, such as Malalas, John of Antioch, Symeon the Logothete, George the Monk, Cedrenus, Glycas, Zonaras, and Theodorus Scutariotes. A subset of this type of text is what we call compact epitomes, works like the *Chronicon Bruxellense*, the *Χρονικὸν ἐπίτομον*, *Χρονογραφικὸν σύντομον* of Nicephorus, and the *Anonymus Matritensis*, which are hardly more than regnal lists that have been briefly annotated from other works, particularly chronicles, often with only a single sentence for each ruler or emperor. In most ways they are exactly like the chronicle epitomes of Isidore and Bede (no. 5, above), but they display no interest in chronology apart from individual regnal years.

When it comes to the definitions just outlined, we are fully aware of how unlikely they are to be widely adopted. Our main goal, rather, is to make everyone who works with these sorts of text think very consciously about generic distinctions before they deploy any of the foregoing vocabulary. That is, we would hope to encourage scholars to think about the validity and the accuracy of the historiographic vocabulary they use to discuss these genres. Given how many, and how many different kinds of, historical works are in question here, it seems counter-productive, even silly, to lump them all together as chronicles, or to separate them artificially from ‘annals’, which are the closest medieval analogue to the chronicles of three thousand years earlier. In other words, we hope to encourage a situation in which everyone knows what they (and we) are talking about when they use the word ‘chronicle’. If the definition remains in doubt, then we shall have failed as serious scientific writers.

## EARLY CHRONICLES IN THE MEDITERRANEAN WORLD

Our last chapter laid out the terminology appropriate to the study of the chronological and historical works of antiquity and separated out the generic distinctions among them, particularly those between narrative and chronographic approaches to the past — the one, in the ancient world, a branch of literature, the other a branch of science. The rest of this study is concerned with the chronographic works themselves, chiefly chronicles and consularia, as we have already seen. The historical development of these genres is the subject of this and the next chapter. The emergence of the chronicle genre concerns us first, for it is much the older of the two.

*Chronicles in Ancient Egypt*

Greek writers like Herodotus claimed to regard Egypt as the font of much Greek learning, but not of the writing of history, which for them was something very Greek. They were wrong about the Greek origins of history writing, but also saw correctly that history did not come to Greece from Egypt: it now seems likely that the idea of keeping chronological records of the past reached Greece via the Near East. That is not to say that Egyptian chronographic writing was poorly developed, however. On the contrary, the nature of the Egyptian calendar made it necessary to keep some sort of chronographic records from a very early date. From *c.* 3000 BC to *c.* 2150 BC, the only way the Egyptians could keep track of the passing years was to employ year-names. In this system, years were named after important events that were planned to occur or had occurred during their course, which in turn meant that date lists had to be compiled to keep track of those names.<sup>1</sup> We do the same

<sup>1</sup> For more details, see below on Babylonian year-names.

in our own lives: that was the year we moved, it was two years after John Lennon was assassinated, it was the year before 9/11, and so on. This process effectively produced brief records involving the juxtaposition of annual timekeeping and historical events, which is to say, the fundamental basis of a chronicle. We cannot be sure of precisely when such records were invented, but they were certainly being kept from the time of the first pharaoh, at the end of the fourth millennium BC. King lists were also compiled, which allowed the use of regnal years.<sup>2</sup> At least one chronicler was able to use these records to produce an annalistic chronicle. Known as the Egyptian Royal Annals, this is both the oldest known chronicle in western history and also the only true chronicle to survive from ancient Egypt.

The Royal Annals were perhaps first compiled between 2470 and 2450 BC, in the middle of the Fifth Dynasty, though that date is controversial, as is so much else about the Annals. At least two copies were made of this early compilation but only at a much later date (see below). The best and most complete text is made up from the well-known Palermo Stone and four other fragments, all but one quite small, now housed in Cairo and London. These are the remains of a copy of the Annals that was probably engraved during the Twenty-fifth Dynasty (*c.* 750–650 BC) on both sides of a block of black basalt, perhaps 2 to 2.5 m wide, about 60 cm high, and about 6.5 cm thick.<sup>3</sup> This inscription was a copy of the Fifth-Dynasty original, which must itself have been preserved as an inscription or on papyrus. The Palermo Stone, the largest surviving fragment, begins with a simple king list, perhaps not very accurate, of the predynastic period in Lower Egypt. This is presented in a horizontal register (or band) of rectangular compartments, each taller than it is wide, with one name per compartment. The subsequent registers on the recto of the stone are similarly constructed from rows of linked compartments, but the right-hand edge of each of these later compartments is formed by a curved palm-rib, the hieroglyphic sign for the word ‘year’. Each of these compartments therefore represents a single civil year within a king’s reign and contains the record of that particular year.

The Annals are thus an annual accounting of approximately 550 years of the activities of the first pharaohs. As the detail for each year becomes greater, so the compartments gradually become larger. For this reason, the recto of the Palermo Stone has six full registers, covering the predynastic kings to those of the early

<sup>2</sup> See Redford 2001, II, 108–11, 234–38.

<sup>3</sup> The thickness of the stone varies considerably. For the Palermo Stone, see Van Seters 1983: 131–34; St John 1999: 1–2 (with excellent illustrations); Wilkinson 1999: 64–66, 218–23; and especially Wilkinson 2000, a comprehensive and balanced introduction that includes illustrations, an overview of major modern scholarship, and transliteration, translation, and commentary. Another translation can be found in Breasted 1906: I, 57–72.

Fourth Dynasty, with the last register made up of much larger compartments than those above it; the verso, however, has only three registers and portions of two others, one at the top and the other at the bottom, with very wide compartments covering just a few years from the late Fourth and early Fifth Dynasties. On the recto, each notice from the second to the fifth register begins with a year-name — which is supplemented from the fourth register with a note of the biennial census — and concludes with the annual height of the Nile inundation. This is the only information contained in these early registers, apart from the occasions when the pharaoh, who is rarely named, undertook a royal progress throughout Egypt.<sup>4</sup> The sixth register, however, shows an increase in detail, though the format is essentially the same. The verso differs from the recto not just in the amount of detail, but in its format as well, particularly in that the name of the ruling pharaoh appears at the head of each entry. The type of events recorded in the Annals is very eclectic: religious and royal festivals, royal visits, building dedications, new temples, dedications of divine images, feasts, ship building, the return of trading expeditions, the foundation of royal estates, the building of walls and new wooden doors for the palace, the listing of the spoils of a defeated enemy, and (only on the verso and comprising most of the information there related) endowments of land and offerings to various sanctuaries. In terms of their focus on the activity of the rulers and their government, the Egyptian Royal Annals are not dissimilar from later chronicles in the Near Eastern and Mediterranean world, though they have a much larger religious component than do any chronicles before late antiquity. The Royal Annals are, however, unique in ancient Egyptian history and have no known antecedents or descendants. As far as anyone can determine, the Annals were compiled from a variety of different sources and were the product of retrospective research rather than the publication of annually compiled material from an official archive. But neither in their original conception nor in their execution were the Annals a historical document as we would now understand the term. They had religious and political purposes, as Wilkinson makes clear:

Prior to the creation of the Turin Canon in the Nineteenth Dynasty, there is little evidence that the Egyptians regarded the recording of history as an objective exercise [...]. The annals were [therefore] very probably intended for a temple setting, perhaps as part of an ancestor cult (like the Karnak king list of Thutmose III and the king list in the temple of Seti I at Abydos) [...]. The entries in the (royal) annals indicate the principal activities (actual or symbolic) in which the king engaged, moreover those which the court deemed worthy of record in a setting which would promote the ideology of divine kingship for eternity. Thus,

<sup>4</sup> This census, known as a 'following of Horus', does not appear in the third register.

the annals are a particularly informative source for how the royal court of the Early Dynastic period and Old Kingdom viewed its own role.<sup>5</sup>

That said, we simply do not understand why the Annals should have been recopied during the Twenty-fifth Dynasty, let alone why at least two copies should have been made at that time.<sup>6</sup>

The Egyptian Royal Annals are unusual not only for being the only chronicle to survive from ancient Egypt, but also in that their conventional title is anomalous within the normal modern terminology for Egyptian and Near Eastern scholarship. Generally speaking, and in contrast to the differing definitions of genre discussed in Chapter 1, the term ‘annals’ usually refers in an ancient Near Eastern context to first-person, near-contemporary accounts of a single king’s campaigns and victories, written as if dictated by that king. They can be very formulaic and are found in Egypt and Assyria in the form of inscriptions. Although they contain much historical information, including names and dates, these texts do not share the main chronographic characteristics of the documents that we call chronicles.<sup>7</sup> We can therefore leave out of account here the various other so-called ‘annals’ of Egyptian and Assyrian history, including the Annals of Thutmose III (1479–1425 BC), a third-person narrative, inscribed by order of Thutmose on the wall of the Temple of Amon-Re at Karnak, covering seventeen military campaigns undertaken over twenty years.<sup>8</sup> In terms of our generic definitions, as given in Chapter 1, these are an interesting combination of chronicle, *breviarium*, and full-blown narrative history, but resemble no later Graeco-Roman or medieval chronographic or historical genre. Chronicles in our sense of the term are represented in Egypt only by

<sup>5</sup> Wilkinson 2000: 62, 66. See especially pp. 60–71 for the purpose of the Royal Annals, their value as a historical source, and their representation of the king and his various roles.

<sup>6</sup> Since two of the surviving seven fragments must derive from a second inscription, there were at least two copies of the Annals: Wilkinson 2000: 24–28.

<sup>7</sup> See Bienkowski and Millard 2000: 21–22, s.v. ‘Annals and Chronicles’ and Glassner 2004: 19–20 (describing Assyrian annals). By this definition, it is incorrect to use the term ‘annals’ for the Palermo Stone text of the Royal Egyptian Annals, not to mention the various Sumerian, Assyrian, and Babylonian king lists that are introduced below. But as we saw in Chapter 1, there is no absolute agreement on such conventions. It would seem a more medieval sense of the word has governed the naming process here.

<sup>8</sup> These ‘annals’ begin from his twenty-second year, following the death of Hatshepsut, and are an annalistic account with exact day, month, and year records, particularly for the first campaign (the famous siege of Meggido), which is narrated in such great detail that it even includes speeches. See Breasted 1906: II, 161–217 (introduction, translation, and commentary) and Van Seters 1983: 147–51.



the Royal Annals, but as a genre are far more common in the ancient Near East, whence the Greeks probably borrowed the tradition of chronicle writing.

### *Chronicles in the Ancient Near East*

#### **Sumerian ‘Chronicles’**

The earliest surviving chronicles of Mesopotamia are those written in Sumerian, though they are not full-blown chronicles like later Babylonian, Greek, and Latin chronicles, but are for the most part merely king lists.<sup>9</sup> Nevertheless they are considered to be chronicles by Near Eastern scholars (who call them ‘royal chronicles’) and are included in Glassner’s important collection of chronicle translations, so we mention them in passing here.<sup>10</sup> While chronicles 2 and 6 in Table 1 derive from unique texts, the Chronicle of the Single Monarchy (no. 1) is known from sixteen copies dating between the twenty-first and seventeenth centuries BC, and the Tummal chronicle (no. 7) is known from ten copies dating to the Old Babylonian Period (1894–1595 BC).<sup>11</sup>

Table 1. Surviving Sumerian Chronicles

Glassner no.	Name	Period covered (BC)
1–2	King lists (‘Royal Chronicles’)	first king to early eighteenth century
6	Royal Chronicle of Lagash	flood to end of twenty-second century
7	Tummal chronicle	twenty-eighth to twentieth century

Nos 1 and 2, the Chronicle of the Single Monarchy and a fragment of a similar work, and to a certain extent no. 6, the Royal Chronicle of Lagash, are nothing more than extended king lists, though no. 6 begins with a short mythological narrative.<sup>12</sup>

<sup>9</sup> See Edzard 1980. The best general introduction to Mesopotamian chronicles in English is Glassner 2004: 3–114. For the distinctions between lists and chronicles in Mesopotamian historiography, and a description of the types, formats, and styles of these chronicles, see Glassner 2004: 15–27 (works that are not chronicles), 37–40, 41–44. See also Grayson 1980a: 177.

<sup>10</sup> Glassner 2004.

<sup>11</sup> With regard to the controversial matter of dates in the ancient Near East, we have relied upon Eder and Renger 2007, Glassner 2004, and Grayson 1975, in that order. When faced with a choice between middle and low dating we have, with Glassner and Grayson, followed the former.

<sup>12</sup> For nos 1 and 2 see the commentary in Glassner 2004: 55–70, 95–110 and Edzard 1980: 77–84; for no. 6, see the commentary in Glassner 2004: 74–75 and Edzard 1980: 84–85.

The Tummal chronicle is a short list of the five instances of the destruction of the sanctuary of Tummal near Nippur and the subsequent reconstruction, giving the names of the kings responsible for the latter.<sup>13</sup> Although the text of the Chronicle of the Single Monarchy breaks off in the eighteenth century, it was originally composed under Naram-Sin, grandson of Sargon, king of Akkad, at the height of the Akkadian Empire, in the third quarter of the twenty-third century BC, and rewritten in Uruk at the time of Utu-hegel, king of Uruk, at the end of the twenty-second century. It is, therefore, the oldest historical work to survive from the Mesopotamian world.<sup>14</sup>

## Assyrian Chronicles

Like their Babylonian predecessors, the Assyrians compiled king lists.<sup>15</sup> From the nineteenth century BC onwards, they compiled *limmu* lists as well.<sup>16</sup> A *limmu* was an eponymous official who held office for one year and gave his name to the year, just like archons in Greece or consuls in Rome. Consequently these lists are usually referred to as eponym lists. Near Eastern eponym lists are thus the exact functional equivalent of Roman *fasti*. Surviving Assyrian eponym lists extend from the nineteenth century down to 612 BC (the fall of Assyria), and a continuous list has been reconstructed between 910 and 612 BC.<sup>17</sup> Sometimes, moreover, these lists were annotated with historical events, like Roman consularia. In Near Eastern contexts, such annotated lists are called eponym chronicles. Just as consularia give the names of consuls, add the phrase *his consulibus* ('when these men were consuls'), and note an event, so Assyrian eponym chronicles usually adhere to a form that runs, 'In the eponymy of (name) + (title) + (event)'.<sup>18</sup>

<sup>13</sup> See the commentary in Glassner 2004: 75–76 and Edzard 1980: 85–86.

<sup>14</sup> See Glassner 2004: 4–7, 38, 95–99, 118.

<sup>15</sup> E.g. Glassner no. 5 = Grayson 1980b: 101–15, 'King List 9' (with introduction and commentary). See also Grayson 1980b: 115–25 for other Assyrian king lists not included by Glassner (King Lists 10–17), of which all but the first three are synchronistic lists that have parallel columns of Assyrian and Babylonian kings.

<sup>16</sup> For the following discussion of Mesopotamian eponyms, year-names, and king lists ('royal chronicles'), see Hallo 1988: 175–86 and Glassner 2004: 16–17.

<sup>17</sup> Millard 1994.

<sup>18</sup> For the *limmu* lists and eponym chronicles, see Ungnad 1938b (with a complete list of all eponyms and eponym texts known at that date, from 1113–1100, 1033–997, 965–964, 954–932, and 910–649 BC, along with other undated texts); Pritchard 1955: 274; Grayson 1975: 196–97; Grayson 1980a: 176–77; Millard 1994: 1–14; van de Mieroop 1999: 20; and Bienkowski and

The earliest known eponym chronicle covers the years from the beginning of the reign of Naram-Sin, king of Ashur (c. 1872 BC), to the end of the reign of Shamshi-Adad I (c. 1776 BC).<sup>19</sup> It survives in five fragments from at least two different editions. The longest eponym chronicle covers the years 858 to 699 and is witnessed by ten different sources. It lists eponyms according to the reigns of the kings and also notes what office the eponym held (such as governor, chamberlain, palace herald, or chief butler). Both of the eponym chronicles just mentioned are for the most part simple lists of military campaigns, but the former also includes a solar eclipse and a flood and the latter includes such things as revolts, times when the king 'stayed in the land' (i.e. did not campaign), foundation and completion of the temple of Nabu in Nineveh, a plague, a solar eclipse, peace, a massacre, the capture of the city of Arpad after three years, times when the king 'took the hand of Bel', and the appointment of governors.<sup>20</sup> Many of these same types of historical entries make up the contents of later chronicles and consularia, although it seems that eponym chronicles took a line more independent of central authority than do Roman lists.<sup>21</sup>

The following are translations from the two Assyrian eponym chronicles noted above. In both cases we have for clarity removed the many square brackets that mark missing text in the original. In the first example (Glassner no. 8) we can see that the bare list of names has been expanded with 'In (the eponymy of)' only when there is an event to be dated. With very few exceptions (one in this quotation) there is only one entry per year.

- In (the eponymy of) Daniya, taking of Hupshum. (1840–1839 BC)
- In (the eponymy of) Ennam-Sin, a flood in a 'remote land'. (1839–1838)
- Ashur-balati. (1838–1837)
- Ennam-Ashur. (1837–1836)
- Itur-Ashur. (1836–1835)
- In (the eponymy of) Shu-beli, Ila-kabkabu took Suprum. (1835–1834)
- In (the eponymy of) Sharrum-Adad, the man of Elam defeated Ipiq-Adad, and King Samsi-Addu entered the house of his father. (1834–33)
- Shu-Laban. (1833–1832)

Millard 2000: 106–07, s.v. 'Eponyms'. Finkel and Reade 1995 sets out some of the rules used for deciding eponyms between 882 and 681 BC.

<sup>19</sup> Glassner no. 8.

<sup>20</sup> Glassner no. 9.

<sup>21</sup> Millard 1994: 6: '[T]hese chronicles deserve more attention than they have usually received, for they attest the existence in Assyria of that "unbiased" attitude which the Babylonian Chronicles allegedly display, representing a style in recording history independent of the imperial image cultivated in the king's courts.' This is the exact opposite of the perspective we find in Roman consularia.

In (the eponymy of) Ashur-imitti, the Lullu defeated the king in Lazapatum. (1832–1831)

In (the eponymy of) Dadaya, Mut-Abbiḥ [...]. (1831–1830)

In (the eponymy of) Dadaya a second time, Ipiq-Adad took Arrapha. (1830–1829)

In (the eponymy of) Ahi-shalim, the taking of Gasur. (1829–1828)

(Glassner 2004: 163)

In the next example (Glassner no. 9), the king's death is noted by stating the number of his regnal years and his name in a separate line after the entry for that year. His successor is then *limmu* in the first full year after his accession, just as Roman emperors usually took the consulship in the first year after their accession. Here, in the ninth century BC, we can see almost fully formed the basic structure of a chronicle organized by the regnal years of kings (in this case marked by *limmu*). Medievalists will have no trouble recognizing what they know as 'annals' in this text, with *limmu* standing in the place of *anni domini*.

Thirty-five years, Shalmaneser, king of Assyria. (823 BC)

In the eponymy of Shamshi-Adad (V), the king of Assyria, revolt. (822)

In the eponymy of Yahalu, the commander in chief, revolt. (821)

In the eponymy of Bel-dan, the palace herald, the insurrection was suppressed. (820)

In the eponymy of Inurta-ubla, governor of [...?...], (campaign) against Mannea. (819)

In the eponymy of Shamash-ilaya, governor of [...], (campaign) against ...shumme. (818)

In the eponymy of Nergal-ilaya, governor of Isana, (campaign) against Tille. (817)

In the eponymy of Ashur-bunaya-usur, the chief butler, (campaign) against Tille. (816)

In the eponymy of Sharru-hattu-ipel, governor of Nasibina, (campaign) against Zaratu. (815)

In the eponymy of Bel-lu-balat, the commander in chief, (campaign) against Der. Anu the Great went to Der. (814)

In the eponymy of Musheknis, governor of Habruri, (campaign) against Ahsana. (813)

In the eponymy of Inurta-ashared, governor of Raqmat, (campaign) against Chaldea. (812)

In the eponymy of Shamash-kumua, governor of Arrapha, (campaign) against Babylon. (811)

In the eponymy of Bel-qate-sabat, governor of Mazamua, (the king stayed) in the land. (810)

Thirteen years, Shamshi-Adad, king of Assyria.

In the eponymy of Adad-nerari (III), the king of Assyria, (campaign) against Media. (809)

(Glassner 2004: 167, 169, modified)

Apart from eponym chronicles, only five fragments of other Assyrian chronicles are extant, mentioning kings between Enlil-narari (1328–1318 BC) and Tiglath-pileser I (1115–1076 BC).<sup>22</sup> Unlike the above-mentioned eponym chronicles, these chronicle fragments have a narrative structure and only the first and last appear to

<sup>22</sup> Glassner nos 11–15. See also Grayson 1975: 66–67, 280; Tadmor 1977: 211.

mention eponyms. Chronicles also seem to lie behind three of the five text columns on the ‘Broken Obelisk’ of Ashur-bel-kala (1073–1056 BC), and a contemporary eponym chronicle probably lies behind information with two *limmu* dates in an Assyrian king list concerning Shamshi-Adad I’s movements before he became king in 1833 BC.<sup>23</sup>

Another Assyrian historical document is a compendium known as the Synchronistic History.<sup>24</sup> This is a blatantly pro-Assyrian account of the border conflicts between Assyria and Babylonia between the reigns of the Assyrian kings Puzur-Ashur III (1490–1477 BC) and Adad-nerari III (811–783 BC), listed by Assyrian kings and purporting to be a copy of an inscription on a stele.<sup>25</sup> The main purpose of this document — it is not really a chronicle — is to demonstrate that there had always been a fixed border between Assyria and Babylonia. The Synchronistic History was written soon after 783 BC and survives in three seventh-century Babylonian copies, two of which are fragmentary. It would seem to have been compiled chiefly from Assyrian royal inscriptions, though parallels between it, the Babylonian Eclectic Chronicle, and Chronicle P suggest now-lost chronicle sources as well, and it is chiefly for this reason that we mention it here.<sup>26</sup>

Table 2. Surviving Assyrian Chronicles<sup>27</sup>

Grayson no.	Glassner no.	Name	Period covered (BC)
	5	Assyrian king list (‘Royal Chronicle’)	earliest kings to 722
	8	Eponym Chronicle (1)	1872 to pre-1776
21	10	Synchronistic History	1490–783
fr. 1	11	Enlil-narari chronicle	1328–1318

<sup>23</sup> Glassner no. 5 (B i.41, 45, pp. 138–39). See Tadmor 1977: 211–12 and Glassner 2004: 136 (for the date of this material). Van Seters (1983: 82–83 n. 101, 84) expressed a once common disbelief in the existence of Assyrian chronicles, but recent discoveries (especially of eponym chronicles, which had previously only been hypothesized) have refuted such extreme views (see Glassner 2004: 38).

<sup>24</sup> Glassner no. 10. It is also referred to as the Synchronistic Chronicle.

<sup>25</sup> See Grayson 1975: 50–56, Van Seters 1983: 83–84, and Glassner 2004: 90.

<sup>26</sup> See Glassner nos 45 and 47 for Chronicle P and the Eclectic Chronicle, and in general, Grayson 1975: 54, 57–58, 64.

<sup>27</sup> For tables 2 and 3, note that Grayson’s introductory notes (pp. 8–67) are separated from the texts and translations (pp. 69–192). Fragmentary texts appear at the end of each of the above-noted sections and are here labelled ‘fr.’. There are also several texts listed in the ‘Addenda et Corrigenda’ (pp. 277–80, 283–84, and 288–89) which are noted with an ‘a’ or ‘b’ here (though 13a appears in the main text), with the exception of ‘b’ on p. 280, which we have labelled ‘(25)’ in table 3.

Grayson no.	Glassner no.	Name	Period covered (BC)
fr. 2	12	Arik-den-ili chronicle	1318–1306
fr. 2a	13	Tukulti-Ninurta chronicle	1244–1207
fr. 3	14	Asshur-resha-ishi chronicle	1133–1115
fr. 4	15	Tiglath-pileser I chronicle	1115–1076
	9	Eponym Chronicle (2)	858–699

## Babylonian Chronicles

From the reign of Sargon, *c.* 2300 BC, down to the thirteenth century BC, year-names were used in such cities as Uruk, Ur, and Nippur, which were Sumerian and later Babylonian cities. Indeed, it was not until 312 BC that the practice was finally abandoned altogether in Babylonia. As had been the case in Egypt, this sort of chronological system meant that date lists had to be compiled if people were to know where in sequence any particular year-name fell or how many years had passed between two cited year-names.<sup>28</sup> Such date lists are known in sequence from the twenty-first to the seventeenth centuries BC and, to give an example of what such things looked like, the following are the designations for years seven to twenty-two of the reign of Hammurabi, king of Babylon (thus *c.* 1786–1771 BC), omitting untranslated words and variants:

Uruk and Isin were conquered.  
The country Emutbal.  
The canal (called) Hammurabi-hegal (was dug).  
Army and inhabitants of Malgia were crushed.  
He (Hammurabi) conquered Rapiqum and Shalibi.  
He constructed a throne for the goddess Sarpanit.  
A copper stand for a royal statue.  
He constructed a throne for the goddess Inanna of Babylon.  
The seven statues.  
He constructed the throne of the god Nabium.  
He made the image of the goddess Inanna of Kabalbarru ‘as high as the sky’.  
He constructed the main dais for Enlil in Babylon.

<sup>28</sup> For year-names, see Ungnad 1938a (which includes texts of all date lists known at the time of its publication); Pritchard 1955: 269–71 (with translations); Grayson 1980a: 171; Van Seters 1983: 69, 132; Sigrist 1988: 1, 13–42; Millard 1994: 1; van de Mieroop 1999: 20–21, 61–62; Wilkinson 2000: 63–64; and Glassner 2004: 16–17. A user-friendly list of year-names from the kingdom of Isin between 2017 and 1792 BC can be found in Sigrist 1988. For Babylonian chronological systems in general, see van de Mieroop 1999: 20–22.

The big wall of Igi-hursag.  
 The year following 'The wall of Igi-hursag' / The throne of Meri.  
 The wall of the town Bazu was built.  
 The statue of Hammurabi (as) king (granting) justice.

(Pritchard 1955: 270)

Given the manner in which years were named, even bare lists such as these could be used as a rudimentary form of chronicle, and there seems to be evidence for just such a use in a document known as 'Date List A'. This cuneiform tablet lists the year-names between the first year of Sumu-abum (1894 BC), founder of Babylon, and the last year of Samsu-iluna (1712 BC) but was compiled sixty-five years after the last date, when there could have been no pragmatic need for such a list of year-names: Date List A was therefore a product of antiquarian interests, and similar antiquarianism would later motivate the compilation of consular fasti at Rome, as we shall see.<sup>29</sup> Alongside date lists of this sort, we also have contemporary evidence for the composition of king lists or 'royal chronicles'. Some contemporary copies survive from as early as the nineteenth and eighteenth centuries BC, but most are later copies compiled from much older originals (see below).<sup>30</sup>

The reign of Nabu-nasir (Nabonassar; 748–734 BC) and the beginning of the Neo-Babylonian period mark the birth of a developed, scholarly historiography that worked to preserve detailed chronological records of contemporary military, political, and religious events. At the same time, we can detect a considerable growth in the historical and antiquarian interests of the Babylonians: there survives a large corpus of tablets preserving the first unambiguous chronicles in Babylonian history. The most important of these are the Babylonian Chronicles, preserved in a large and still growing series of cuneiform texts, organized by the regnal years of successive kings.<sup>31</sup> As in later Roman consularia, these texts briefly describe events

<sup>29</sup> See Grayson 1980a: 171–72; Glassner 2004: 17: 'The end result might suggest to us compilation serving primarily administrative or juridical purposes, but the extent of the longest lists far exceeds requirements for such purposes, so we may discern in them the products of genuine chronological inquiry.'

<sup>30</sup> Unfortunately Grayson 1975 includes no king lists and Glassner 2004 only a few representative examples (the only ones we have included in the table below). The earliest known king lists were published instead in Grayson 1980b: 89–90, 96–97 as follows: (1) Larsa King List, from 2025 to 1738/37 BC, the date of composition; (2) Ur-Isin King List, covering the Third Dynasty of Ur and the First Dynasty of Isin, written *c.* 1812 BC; and (4) King List C, 1157–1069 BC, written soon afterwards.

<sup>31</sup> For this chronicle series, see the important analysis of Glassner 2004: 4, 77–84. See also Grayson 1975: 8–28; Grayson 1980a: 171–75; Grayson 1980b: 86–87; and Van Seters 1983: 79–92.

under each regnal year in a formulaic manner and contain day and month dates. Originally, they formed a number of different copies of a single continuous work that described the history of Babylonia from *c.* 747 BC down to at least the Parthian period (after 141 BC).<sup>32</sup> The most important aspect of the Babylonian Chronicle series is the straightforward, objective, and accurate reporting of events, likewise a characteristic of later Greek chronicles and Roman consularia.<sup>33</sup> Interestingly, these chronicles seem to have been written down originally not on cuneiform tablets but rather on writing boards, more familiar to classicists as codices of wax tablets.<sup>34</sup> It must also be recognized that these works were not originally composed by historians, in our sense of the word, but by anonymous scholarly record-keepers, who in many cases were interested in preserving an accurate record of the events of the past as a means of divination for determining the future.<sup>35</sup> It is interesting

<sup>32</sup> For the date of the latest chronicle, see Finkel and van der Spek (forthcoming). There may be another as late as 94 BC (Finkel and van der Spek forthcoming: no. 20). On the formulaic nature of these chronicles and the singular, continuous nature of the Neo- and Late Babylonian chronicles, see Grayson 1975: 8–10, tempered with van der Spek 2008: 280–84.

<sup>33</sup> Grayson 1975: 10–11; Glassner 2004: 48–51 (a balanced approach); and van der Spek 2003: 290, 291, 299, 340–41, esp. ‘The most remarkable feature of the chronicles is their detached treatment of historical facts. It is not historiography in the sense that it gives a coherent narrative of history and searches for deeper causes; rather it presents facts about kings, their lengths of reign, their successes and defeats in battle, and facts about the city of Babylon, its temple and cult. The style is terse [...]. Apart from an interest in the rise and fall of kings, the rise and fall of dynasties and empires was important for them’ (pp. 291 and 296). The parallels with consularia are very clear.

<sup>34</sup> Grayson 1975: 14, 34.

<sup>35</sup> This idea is expressed very well by van der Spek 2003: 289–92, 340, esp. ‘These chronicles are not examples of beautiful historical narrative; they are rather a database. Babylonian history writing was an exact science and part of the aggregate whole of Babylonian wisdom’ (p. 290); and van der Spek 2008: 284, 285–87, esp. ‘it was history for the sake of divination. To serve this research it was necessary to make exact records of historical facts, so that the pursuit of divinatory science could go hand in hand with the study of reliable and well-dated historical facts’ (p. 284). See also Glassner 2004: 7–10 for Mesopotamian ideas of cyclical time and the importance of knowing the past for understanding the future, and pp. 11–15, 21–27, 40–41 for important discussions of the identities of the Mesopotamian authors and compilers of these works and their historiographical aims and views: ‘Whatever the explanation, humanity, to take control of the future, had to learn from the past’ (p. 27). See also Drews 1975: 43–45, who goes too far in stressing these particular aspects in the composition and preservation of these documents (in reply, see Lambert 1976; Van Seters 1983: 91–92), and Grayson 1980a: 188–94. It must be noted that, as is the case with classical and Christian chronicles, we possess no ‘autograph’ chronicles (at least that we know of): they are all copies of earlier works (Glassner 2004: 37).



to note that even though the Assyrians and Babylonians wrote chronicles, clearly works of history, they had no word for history or history writing.<sup>36</sup>

Along with the Babylonian Chronicle series, the growth of the historical awareness of the Babylonians in the Neo-Babylonian period prompted the writing of other new chronicles, king lists, and chronographic works, though not necessarily in the same style, in the same detail, or even covering the same topics as the Babylonian Chronicles. It also prompted the search for older chronicles, which were recopied verbatim or reworked and updated. For example, the Babylonian Royal Chronicle lists the kings of Babylon from the creation of the world down to the middle of the eighth century BC.<sup>37</sup> Another chronicle provides a list of commodity prices over a thousand-year period from at least the eighteenth century BC if not earlier.<sup>38</sup> Still others are solely interested in religious phenomena.<sup>39</sup> All these chronicles, which covered events before the Neo-Babylonian period in which they were written, had to have been compiled from many diverse sources, some of which were almost certainly older chronicles, date lists, and king lists. A list of all published chronicles appears in Table 3, below. It should be noted, however, that although the chronicles listed in the first part of this table cover events before the eighth century, the cuneiform tablets themselves date to the seventh century or later (no. 48, for instance, is dated to explicitly 14 August 251 BC).

<sup>36</sup> See van der Spek 2008: 277–79 for an important analysis of genre and historiography, relating to both Mesopotamian chronicles and later Mediterranean history writing. This is a particularly interesting point in view of our discussion of genre and nomenclature in Chapter 1: just because a society had no word for something (e.g. chronicles or consularia, or in this case, ‘history’) does not mean that that it did not exist.

<sup>37</sup> Glassner no. 3. The other later royal chronicles not included by Grayson 1975 or Glassner 2004 in their collections were published in Grayson 1980b: 90–96, 97–98, 100–01, 125: (3) King List A, extending from at least the First Dynasty of Babylon (1894–1595 BC) to at least the beginning of the Chaldean dynasty (625 BC); (5) Uruk King List, a fragmentary list extending from Kandalanu (647–627 BC) on the recto to Seleucus II (246–226 BC) on the verso, with a gap between 486 and 335; (7) King List B, the kings of the First Dynasty of Babylon and of the Sealand dynasty (c. 1732–c. 1460 BC), but written later, in Neo-Babylonian; (8) the Ptolemaic Canon, a list composed ultimately from Babylonian sources by Claudius Ptolemaeus of Alexandria in the mid-second century AD, covering the kings from Nabu-nasir to Nabonidus; and (18) Babylon I King List Fragment, with the names of three kings from the First Dynasty of Babylon. Glassner no. 4 in the table below = King List 6 in this collection (Grayson 1980b: 98–100).

<sup>38</sup> Chronicle of Market Prices (Glassner no. 50).

<sup>39</sup> E.g. the Akitu Chronicle, covering 689–626 BC (Glassner no. 20) and the Religious Chronicle, covering pre-1034 to post-943 BC (Glassner no. 51). See also Grayson 1975: 29–65; Grayson 1980b: 87–89; and Glassner 2004: 84–88, 110–11. For a discussion of the literary patterns of Babylonian chronicles as a group, see Grayson 1975: 4–7, 193–201.

Table 3. Surviving Babylonian Chronicles<sup>40</sup>

Grayson no.	Glassner no.	Name	Period covered (BC)
18	3	King list ('Royal Chronicle')	Creation to eighth century
19	38	Weidner Chronicle	third millennium
20	39–40	Chronicle of Early Kings	c. 2340–c. 1450
	48	Shulgi chronicle	2094–2047
fr. 1–2	41–42	Fragments of Chronicle	early second millennium
23	50	Chronicle of Market Prices	pre-1765–c. 748?
22	45	Chronicle P	fourteenth to thirteenth century
(25)	46	Walker Chronicle	post-1218–pre-1046
24	47	Eclectic Chronicle	pre-1080–post-722
17	51	Religious Chronicle	pre-1034–post-943
1	16–17	Neo-Babylonian Chronicle series	748–668
15	19	Shamash-suma-ukin Chronicle	pre-694–652
16	20	Akitu Chronicle	689–626
14	18	Esarhaddon Chronicle	680–668
2	21	Neo-Babylonian Chronicle series	626–623
3	22	Neo-Babylonian Chronicle series	616–609
4	23	Neo-Babylonian Chronicle series	608–606
5	24	Neo-Babylonian Chronicle series	605–595
6	25	Neo-Babylonian Chronicle series	557
7	26	Neo-Babylonian Chronicle series	556–539
fr. 2a	27	Fragment of chronicle	?
9	28	Late Babylonian Chronicle series	345–344
8	29	Late Babylonian Chronicle series	331
10	30	Late Babylonian Chronicle series	321–320 to 309–308
	31	Fragment of chronicle	330s
11	32	Late Babylonian Chronicle series	294–293 to 281–280
12	33	Late Babylonian Chronicle series	311 or 305 to 281–280
13	34	Late Babylonian Chronicle series	281–260 to 245–226
13a	36	Late Babylonian Chronicle series	Seleucid Period
13b	35	Late Babylonian Chronicle series	225–224 to 223–222
	37	Judicial Chronicle	Seleucid Period
	4	Hellenistic Royal Chronicle	330–125

<sup>40</sup> Finkel and van der Spek (forthcoming), when it appears, will contain many chronicles of the Hellenistic period that do not appear in Grayson or Glassner. Until publication, a draft text can be consulted online (see Bibliography for URL).

The similarities of these texts to later classical chronicles is striking and worth making obvious by means of a few quotations, which we reproduce from Glassner in Appendix 3 below.<sup>41</sup> This is not because they are intrinsic to the argument developed in the present volume, but so that the reader may make comparisons with the Greek chronicles translated in Appendix 4 and Roman and late antique texts translated in our subsequent volumes (and previewed in Appendix 5); the parallels of presentation and content are quite surprisingly precise.

As we shall see in later chapters, Greek and Roman chronicles often report strange events that are regarded as important not only for the fact that they are unusual but also because of their religious and historical significance as portents and signs. We saw the appearance of similar natural phenomena in Assyrian eponym chronicles above. Although the Babylonian Chronicle series does not contain such material, we do find it in the Neo-Babylonian Religious Chronicle, translated in Appendix 3.4 below.

We still lack sufficient evidence to state definitively that a continuous tradition of chronicle writing leads back from the eighth century BC all the way to the nineteenth century, but there is now too much detailed and concrete evidence for one to be able to state that chronicles did not exist at all in Mesopotamia before the eighth century, something that still seemed quite plausible thirty years ago.<sup>42</sup> For Assyria, at least, the recent discoveries of the eponym chronicles completely dispels former scepticism in that regard.<sup>43</sup> In Babylonia, it is true that the oldest extant information derives from copies dating as late as the Hellenistic period. But the extant documents must reflect a pre-existing chronicle tradition, whether continuous or not, and we can now state with certainty that Sumerian and Assyrian chronographic traditions influenced Babylonian practices in documentable ways. Just as the texts of Livy and Pompeius Trogus disappeared either entirely or in large part once epitomes had been made of their works, so any older Babylonian chronicles were discarded when new versions and compilations were made in the Neo- and Late Babylonian periods. Similarly most Greek and Latin literature survives in manuscripts copied hundreds of years after the original composition. Homer is a particularly good example of the survival of an early text only in manuscript copies made hundreds and thousands of years later. The hypothesis that Babylonian

<sup>41</sup> Drews 1975: 43–44 rightly compares Babylonian chronicles to the Parian Marble and later Christian chronographies.

<sup>42</sup> Van Seters 1983: 81–91.

<sup>43</sup> Glassner 2004: 38. Though it must be stated that all five of the other extant chronicle fragments (Glassner nos 11–15) had already been published by Grayson in 1975.

chronicles have a similar history of transmission is supported by the evidence of the king lists: king lists written in the nineteenth, eighteenth, and eleventh centuries have been discovered. Moreover, although the Babylonian 'Royal Chronicle' survives only in four copies from the Neo-Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian periods (912–612 and 626–539 BC), the fact that its title is preserved in a catalogue of the Old Babylonian period (1894–1595 BC) shows that it was originally composed long before the date of the extant tablets.<sup>44</sup>

Many different sources were available to Assyrian and Babylonian chroniclers, and they made use of a wide variety of them, including the types of documentary sources that Greek and Latin historiography ignored until the time of the Christian writers of the fourth century AD. Among these documentary sources were royal inscriptions and royal letters which could be employed alongside date lists, eponym lists, king lists, lists of omens and oracles, and astronomical diaries.<sup>45</sup> Other literary and historical compositions were of use to chroniclers as well, such as historical narratives in verse, annals in the Near Eastern sense of the word, pseudo-biographies, and prophetic and apocalyptic writings, which were chiefly collections of *vaticinationes post eventum*. There is also evidence of important cross-cultural influence between Assyrian and Babylonian chronicles.<sup>46</sup>

Elsewhere in the Near East, however, the evidence for chronicles is much patchier. There may have been Israelite and Phoenician chronicles, the former used

<sup>44</sup> Glassner 2004: 52 n. 7, 109, 126. Note also the colophon preserved at the end of Chronicle 16 in Appendix 3.1 below: it was copied around the year 500 from a pre-existing 'ancient model'.

<sup>45</sup> These latter were monthly accounts of astronomical and meteorological phenomena that included contemporary statements about commodity prices, the height of the rivers, and sometimes important historical events. Although it was once believed that these astronomical diaries were the chief or even sole source for Babylonian chronicles (e.g. Van Seters 1983: 80–81 and n. 97), the evidence for them appears regularly only from the time of Nebuchadnezzar II (604–562 BC), more than 150 years after the Neo-Babylonian chronicles began to appear. Furthermore, where the two types of documents overlap in extant copies, there are few similarities (in one particular case of overlap, the chronicle is more detailed than the diary). Specialists have now realized that if astronomical diaries were sources for chronicles, they were used only infrequently (see in particular Glassner 2004: 19, 46–48), though new discoveries have nevertheless shown a close relationship between these similar types of works (van der Spek 2008: 284–85). More generally, it would seem that the changing intellectual outlook within Babylonian culture that was responsible for the growth and development of the Babylonian chronicle series also gave rise to the astronomical diaries.

<sup>46</sup> For all these sources, see Glassner 2004: 15–21, 45–48, and van der Spek 2008: 284–87, along with Grayson 1975: 6, 11–14, 22 n. 143, 29, 32, 34, 36, 38, 44, 45–47, 60–61, 194–95 (see also at note 26, above, on the sources for the Synchronistic History). See also van der Spek 2003: 291, with bibliography.

by the author of the biblical Book of Kings and the latter by the Phoenician historians Menander and Dios, but this is very uncertain.<sup>47</sup> Interestingly, the Hittites never seem to have developed any chronicle or chronographic genre.<sup>48</sup>

The foregoing discussion of chronicles and chronography in the Near East is not meant to suggest that Greek chronicles, still less Roman consularia, were modelled directly on Egyptian, Sumerian, Assyrian, or Babylonian practice. Wherever names and regnal years — as opposed to enumeration from a fixed point — are used to identify annual units of time, this kind of historiography is the simplest and most natural method of tracking the past.<sup>49</sup> It could very naturally have developed independently in many Mediterranean cultures. Nevertheless, parallels of structure, content, and origin between Greek and Near Eastern chronicles are quite striking. We suspect, though it is at present beyond demonstration, that Babylonian and perhaps Assyrian chronographic practices did indeed influence Greek chronographic methods at some point after the mid-fifth century BC. The growing body of evidence for close and productive contact between mainland Greece, Ionia, and the various Near Eastern cultures from the archaic period onwards makes it difficult to deny any historiographic interchange between the regions.<sup>50</sup> And the continuation of Babylonian chronography down into the Parthian period and beyond makes it even more likely that Greeks would have had access to and known about these chronicles. We have here yet more evidence that the chronicles of late antiquity should be seen not as the creation of Latin Christendom, but rather as

<sup>47</sup> See Van Seters 1981: 175–82 and Van Seters 1983: 292–302 and the next chapter for Menander and Dios. The Book of Kings stands out in particular as either being based upon a chronicle or imitating the structure of one.

<sup>48</sup> Grayson 1975: 2; Hoffner 1980: 303, 305–06, 313–14, who lists two works called chronicles, which he admits are not; and Van Seters 1983: 100, 101–02, 113, 122. There do, however, survive records of royal offerings that are sometimes referred to incorrectly as king lists (see Otten 1980). There are also a number of annals (first-person narratives, according to the definition of Near Eastern scholars): see Van Seters 1983: 100–26, esp. 105–13. For a short overview, see Bryce 2005: 390–91.

<sup>49</sup> This is clear from such things as Chinese chronicles (see ‘Chapter 1, note 57’ in the Appendices to the Footnotes, p. 360 below), which clearly have no connection with Mediterranean examples, and yet are very similar to Babylonian, Greek, and Latin chronicles.

<sup>50</sup> See in general the large body of work by Walter Burkert, esp. 1992 and 2004, as well as O. Murray 1993: 81–101; Kuhrt 1987: 50–52; West 2000 (on fables); Raaflaub 2000 (on political thought); Lanfranchi 2000; and Kuhrt 2002: 481. Further detailed discussion of this matter can be found in ‘Chapter 2, note 50’ in the Appendices to the Footnotes, pp. 361–63 below.

part of a common historiographic continuum stretching back three thousand years and involving many different cultures.

### *The Prehistory of Greek Chronicles*

Whether or not the ultimate origins of the late antique chronicle genre really do lie in the Neo-Babylonian period or earlier, it is in the Hellenistic Greek chronicle tradition that the immediate precedents for the genre are to be found. The earliest Greek chronographic works, if not yet fully developed chronicles in our definition of the term, are believed to have been ὥροι (*horoi*), a sort of local or civic history. Their name, just like the Latin term *annales*,<sup>51</sup> implies an annual reporting, though it may merely refer to a more or less chronological approach to the narrative, in comparison to the thematic, geographical, or genealogical approach of earlier mythological tales. Written in Ionia from the early to mid-fifth century BC, these *horoi* combined local chronology, tradition, genealogy, and particularly mythology, with an emphasis on the former.<sup>52</sup> The earliest attested *horos* was probably written by Charon of Lampsacus, perhaps in the second quarter of the fifth century BC, although he has been dated as late as 400 BC.<sup>53</sup> It was called Ὅροι Λαμψακηνῶν (*Horoi of the Lampsacenes*) and was composed in four books.<sup>54</sup> The most important

<sup>51</sup> See Censorinus, *De die natali*, 19. 6 for this exact equivalence.

<sup>52</sup> For *horoi*, see Pearson 1942: 3–4, Jacoby 1949: 68–70, 182–84, 199–202, 225; and Fornara 1983: 16–23, 25–26, who calls the genre ‘chroniclelike’ (p. 21). For local history, see Clarke 2008: 169–244. For pre-Thucydidean history as a whole, see Toye 1995. For the possibility of non-historical, preliminary chronicles, see Jacoby 1949: 176–88, though this is pure speculation: see Toye 1995: 281 n. 3.

<sup>53</sup> On Charon and his works, see *RE*, 1. III. 2, 2179–80 (Schwartz); *OCD*, 319 (Meister); *DNP*, II, 1108–09 (Meister); Jacoby 1949: 68 n. 113, 100, 101, 228 n. 11; Fowler 2006: 40. The late date for Charon was favoured by Jacoby, who tended to push the dates of the earliest local historians down later than that of Herodotus to suit his own theories about the ways in which history developed before and after ‘The Father of History’ (summarized by Toye 1995, Luraghi 2001b: 4–10, and Möller 2001: 242–48). A corrective back-dating has begun in recent years: Toye 1995: 283; Bertelli 2001: 71 n. 13; Fowler 1996; Fowler 2001: 95–98; and Fowler 2006; see too the positive response from other scholars such as Hornblower 2006: 309. Not everyone is convinced, however: Fornara 1983: 16–23; O. Murray 2001b: 319.

<sup>54</sup> *FgrHist*, 262 F 1–2, with *FgrHistK*, 1–9. Charon also wrote a Πρυτάνεις οἱ τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων (*Prytaneis of the Lacedaemonians*). *Prytaneis* were presidents or civic officials, though in this instance we do not know whether the title refers to kings or ephors at Sparta, since the Spartans did not have officials named *prytaneis* (Jacoby 1949: 59). This work seems to have been

development of the early *horos* tradition was the Ἀττικὴ ξυγγραφή (*History of Attica*), written in two books by Hellanicus of Lesbos. It is a type of history that later came to be called the *Atthis*, but it was not, at this stage, a chronicle, though it is often still described as one.<sup>55</sup> As the genre of *Atthides* became more popular, more research was devoted to the topic and the works grew in size. The last Atthidographer, Philochorus, wrote in 260 BC and composed a work in seventeen books. Of these, books seven to nine were devoted to the end of the Four Years' War, while the last eight books treated five years apiece.<sup>56</sup>

These last eleven books of Philochorus are certainly not a chronicle, but Dionysius of Halicarnassus, writing under Augustus, says that *Atthides* were in general histories that concerned chronology (αἱ χρονικά [ιστορίαι]; *Antiquitates Romanae*, 1. 8. 3), no doubt because of their archon-based annalistic structure.<sup>57</sup> This should warn us to be careful in drawing inferences from the vocabulary used by ancient authors to describe early historical works, especially in general sweeping descriptions. The *Suda*, to take another example, explicitly calls Charon of Lampascus's *Prytaneis* a 'chronicle' (χρονικά; *FgrHist*, 262 T 1), but since we know neither how the *Suda*, or rather the *Suda*'s source, defined χρονικά nor whether the author or his source had even seen the work, we cannot be certain what precisely is meant apart from the fact that someone believed that the *Prytaneis* was a

a kind of *horos* as well, but nothing of it survives except the title, so it is difficult to say: Christesen 2007: 106–07. Since 1838, some have believed that the title has been corrupted and should read 'Lampsacenes' instead of 'Lacedaemonians', making it nothing more than a variant name for the *Horoi* just mentioned: Fowler 1996: 67 n. 44 and Fowler 2006: 40. This is an attractive suggestion.

<sup>55</sup> *FgrHist*, 323a F 1–29, with *FgrHistK*, 1–57 and 1–70; *RE*, 1. VIII. 1, 104–55, esp. pp. 138–43 (Gudeman); *OCD*, 677 (Harding); *DNP*, v, 295–96 (Meister); Niese 1888a: 81–86; Pearson 1939: 152–235; Pearson 1942: 1–26; Jacoby 1949: 59–60, 68–69, 151, 215–25 ('it is not certain that the Ἀττικὴ ξυγγραφή was the first Local Chronicle', p. 225); Harding 1994: 1–10, 48–50; Christesen 2007: 100–01; and Toye 1995: 293–95 ('Hellanicus' *Attic History* [...] was not a chronicle', p. 293). The date of composition is unknown: see Toye 1995: 293–94. Jacoby 1949 is a dense and highly polemical rebuttal of much accumulated German scholarship of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, especially Wilamowitz's influential theory on the origin of the *Atthides*. Jacoby's arguments were successful and his work remains the standard account of the *Atthides*, though, as noted above, his chronologies are now being called into question. He should nevertheless be consulted for all aspects of Greek historiography in the fifth and early fourth centuries. For Jacoby and Wilamowitz and the evidence for their hypotheses, see now Christesen 2007: 88–107 and Clarke 2008: 175–93, 315–16.

<sup>56</sup> *FgrHist*, 328 F 1–71 with *FgrHistK*, 220–350 (of 3b supplement 1) and 171–254 (of 3b supplement 2); Harding 1994: 32–33.

<sup>57</sup> Verbrughe 1989: 214–16.

work that concerned chronology in some way.<sup>58</sup> It may therefore be correct to speak of *horoi* as 'local chronicles' or 'chronicle-like' and of Hellanicus's *History of Attica* as a 'chronicle', in the general sense that they imposed an unusually rigid form of chronological development on their narratives.<sup>59</sup> Nevertheless, without extensive fragments, as opposed to simple quotations or citations, or even just titles, we cannot judge, let alone prove, whether these early works were in fact chronicles according to the criteria we set out in Chapter 1. The evidence we have suggests that the *horoi* were not chronicles in the sense that earlier Babylonian and Assyrian chronicles, or later Hellenistic ones, were.<sup>60</sup>

We are on slightly surer ground with another work that appeared around 400 BC, a list of Olympic victors compiled by Hippias of Elis. Compilations along such lines would later be used as a basis for historical chronology, but at this early stage they were mere lists not chronicles.<sup>61</sup> Nevertheless, all these early works attest to a strong and growing interest in detailed chronography among early Greek historians, in the same period that the great works of narrative history were being produced. It would also seem that Hippias was the first person to establish the date of the first Olympiad (776 BC by our reckoning), which would prove so fundamental for later Greek chronological reckoning (see 'Chapter 2, n. 78' in the Appendices to the Footnotes, p. 364 below). This sort of chronographic interest was the necessary preliminary for the development of true chronicles in the Greek world, which could not have existed without it.<sup>62</sup>

The first major step in the development of the Greek chronicle tradition has often been regarded as Hellanicus's *Τέρειαί τῆς Ἡράς αἱ ἐν Ἀργεῖ* (*Priestesses of*

<sup>58</sup> For the *Suda*, see Dickey 2007: 90–91.

<sup>59</sup> On the basis of Dionysius and Philochorus, Harding 1994: 3–6 seems to imply a detailed annalistic structure for all such 'chronicles', even Hellanicus.

<sup>60</sup> Toye 1995 argues persuasively that none of the pre-Thucydidean works can be considered chronicles.

<sup>61</sup> In *FgrHist*, Jacoby includes Hippias's victor list third among the early chroniclers (IIB text, p. 992), but in his *Atthis* he admits that it is not a chronicle (1949: 58–59, 297 n. 6). For Hippias and his list, see the major study by Christesen 2007: 45–160, 368, 475–81, 491–504. Möller 2004: 173–74, 176–78 suggests that this work had a more traditional literary structure than would a simple list, as Geus 2002: 330–32 suggests was the case with Eratosthenes' *Ὀλυμπιονίκαι* (*Olympic Victors*) as well (on whom, see below).

<sup>62</sup> For a general but very brief discussion of the importance of chronology for the Greeks before the Hellenistic period (and an interesting justification for the serious study of chronology), see Grafton 1995.



*Hera at Argos*), written shortly after 423.<sup>63</sup> Although it no longer survives, we have a description which says that Hellanicus ‘recorded the priestesses in Argos and the events that happened in the time of each one’ (*FgrHist*, 4 F 84). Unfortunately, the surviving fragments of the *Τέπειαι* almost all derive from an epitome (or perhaps two conflated epitomes) of a geographical work written by a late grammarian, Stephanus of Byzantium.<sup>64</sup> We therefore have little overall sense of Hellanicus’s work, though it clearly related events across the entire Greek world, and not merely those concerning Argos or its Temple of Hera. As a result, Jacoby called it the first universal Greek chronicle.<sup>65</sup> However, while it certainly was more universal than anything that had come before, that identification is fragile.<sup>66</sup> It was perhaps a synchronism of genealogies and oral traditions more than a thoroughly annalistic chronicle of the type we know from the Hellenistic period.<sup>67</sup> It may indeed have become annalistic, or more annalistic, as it reached the contemporary period. It would therefore be rash to insist on Hellanicus’s place as the first true Greek chronicler, particularly when a much better candidate for that identification appears over one hundred years later.

This is Demetrius of Phaleron, who wrote an *Ἀρχόντων ἀναγραφή* (*Register of Archons*), presumably as a natural outgrowth of the early *Atthis* tradition. Demetrius’s *Ἀρχόντων ἀναγραφή* included a list of Athenian archons going back at least to 582/81, and the references to it and descriptions that survive look very much like the remains of an early chronicle.<sup>68</sup> Under the appropriate archon year, Demetrius referred to Thales, Anaxagoras, the return of exiles at the time of Thucydides, and the death of Socrates, exactly the type of subject matter that appears in later Hellenistic chronicles. We do not know whether Demetrius composed his work in the last quarter of the fourth century or during his time in Alexandria from 297, but his role as the first certain Greek chronicler known to scholarship seems secure.<sup>69</sup>

<sup>63</sup> *FgrHist*, 4 F 74–84, with *FgrHistK*, 454–58; Niese 1888a: 86–91; *RE*, 1. VIII. 1, 144–48 (Gudeman); and Christesen 2007: 95–99.

<sup>64</sup> See *OCD*, 1442 (Browning) and *ODB*, 1953–54.

<sup>65</sup> Jacoby 1949: 59 and 225, and *FgrHistK*, 454 (commentary on *FgrHist*, 4).

<sup>66</sup> As Toye 1995: 291–93 demonstrates.

<sup>67</sup> Möller 2001.

<sup>68</sup> *FgrHist*, 228 F 1–3 and 10, with *FgrHistK*, 641–46, 648; *RE*, 1. IV. 2, 2817–41, esp. p. 2831 (Martini); *RE Suppl.*, XI, 514–22, esp. p. 520 (Wehrli); and *DNP*, III, 429–30 (Schütrumpf).

<sup>69</sup> Note that while Demetrius is often taken to be the founder of the library at Alexandria, which would provide a context for his ‘Register’, there are real problems with his identification as

## *The Origins and Development of Greek Chronicles*

No substantial fragments survive from Demetrius's Ἀρχόντων ἀναγραφή, just a few references to and citations from it. The first work that we can describe as a chronicle on the basis of material extant in its original form is the Parian Marble, or *Marmor Parium*, preserved on an inscribed stone from Paros.<sup>70</sup> Two fragments of this chronicle survive out of what was once a 200 by 69 cm inscription, roughly the same size as the Egyptian Palermo Stone, discussed above.<sup>71</sup> It was inscribed in 264/63 BC and presents a combination of Athenian and Greek political, military, religious, and intellectual history, which starts with Cecrops, treated here as the first king of Athens (as he was in Hellanicus's *History of Attica*), in the year we would call 1581–1580 BC. Its chronology is a countdown to the time of writing, supplemented from 683–682 BC with the name of the annual archon. Jacoby rightly considered it a member of the *Atthis* family, even though it presents a much less parochial view of Athenian history than one normally finds in that tradition.<sup>72</sup> The Parian Marble contains data on well-known mythological figures, as well as on important kings, particularly those of Macedonia, Syracuse, and Persia. It also refers to the foundations of leading cities and games and to important battles and political events and names many philosophers, poets, and playwrights, often with the dates of their major victories and sometimes with biographical information on their births or deaths. Also mentioned are the eruption of Mount Etna, a

the first Alexandrian librarian, however important his role may have been in developing the collection it later held: Pfeiffer 1968: 98–102 and Tracy 2000: 343–44.

<sup>70</sup> It may seem odd to readers that anything like a chronicle would have been published as an inscription, but we shall see another example below from Italy (the *Chronicon Romanum*), while an eighth- or ninth-century Syriac chronicle was found inscribed on the wall of a church in southern Turkey, on the Euphrates near Gaziantep (Chabot 1900: 285–88 and Pognon 1907: 148–51, no. 84). Three fragments of what is always described as a chronicle have been found in Pergamon, but there is no evidence of chronology: see 'Chapter 2, note 87' in the Appendices to the Footnotes, p. 365 below. For a detailed overview of Greek history preserved epigraphically, see Chaniotis 1988: 1–286. The Parian Marble is number T 22 (pp. 87–89). For three entries excerpted from a Greek chronicle that were found in a mosaic from Apamea in Syria dated to April 431 (Arab attack on Seriana, mod. Isriya), 432/33 (famine), and 27 January 499 (heavy snowfall), see Yon and Gatier 2009: 110–11.

<sup>71</sup> *FgrHist*, 239, with *FgrHistK*, 665–702 or *IG*, XII. 5. 1, no. 444 (pp. 100–11), XII. 5. 2, no. 444 (p. 315), and XII suppl., no. 444 (p. 110); *RE*, I. XIV. 2, 1885–97 (Laqueur); *DNP*, VII, 938 (Meister); Jacoby 1904; and Clarke 2008: 212–13, 227–28, 325–35. A translation of the entire surviving portions appears in Appendix 4.1 below.

<sup>72</sup> Jacoby 1949: 1 and 227–28 n. 5.

meteorite, an eclipse, an earthquake, and a comet. This sort of information would remain the standard subject matter of chronicles for almost six hundred years until, at the beginning of the fourth century AD, Eusebius added Old Testament history, the story of the life of Christ, and ecclesiastical history to the mix.

The Greek chronographic works discussed in the previous section cover a wide area both chronologically and geographically. We do not know whether they represent independent responses to a common historiographical impulse, indigenous or Near Eastern, or whether they form part of a single, interconnected tradition of which nothing else survives. The loss of all Greek chronographic writing before the Parian Marble means that the Greek chronicle appears to spring into existence, like Athena, fully formed, but that is most unlikely to be the case. The Parian Marble must have had written antecedents, however difficult it is for us to determine what they were (although, as noted above, Demetrius's 'Ἀρχόντων ἀναγραφὴ is a plausible father or step-father). Indeed, the Parian Marble must also have had contemporary siblings beyond the island of Paros, written on papyrus scrolls.

This is proved by an entry about a meteorite that fell at Aegospotami in c. 468 BC. This entry appears in almost identical wording and in exactly the same year in both the Parian Marble and in Eusebius's *Chronici canones*, composed over 575 years later in AD 325.<sup>73</sup> Neither Eusebius nor any of his predecessors had been to Paros to see the inscribed chronicle there, and Eusebius seems to be reporting a fuller version of the original entry. They both derive, independently and at least in Eusebius's case indirectly, from a written chronicle older than the Parian Marble. Likewise, the Parian Marble, Eusebius, and Julius Africanus, a Christian chronographer of the early third century AD (see Chapter 3), all date the mythical flood of Deucalion to almost the same years (the equivalent of our 1528, 1526, and 1531 BC respectively), and the Parian Marble and Eusebius date the foundation of the Pythian games to 581 BC. This proves that by 263 BC (the date of the Parian Marble) earlier chroniclers and chronographers had already worked out much of the basic chronology of Greek prehistory and history to the general satisfaction of later chroniclers. In other words, the Parian Marble may be the earliest Greek chronicle

<sup>73</sup> Parian Marble: 'ἐν Αἰγὸς Ποταμοῖς ὁ λίθος ἔπεσε' (A 57; six years before the accession of Perdiccas II of Macedonia) and Eusebius: 'λίθος ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἔπεσεν ἐν Ποταμοῖς Αἰγός' (*Chron. can.*, 110<sup>f</sup> = Syncellus, *Ecl. chron.*, p. 305.3; six years before the accession of Perdiccas II of Macedonia). The absolute values for the dates in each are 469–468 and 467–466. Theagenides, the archon named in the Parian Marble, was archon in 468–467. Perdiccas's accession is now usually dated to the last half of the 450s, which would put the meteorite in 460 or the next few years. For two other parallels between Eusebius and the Parian Marble, see Burgess 1999: 201, 208.

to survive in its original form, but we can demonstrate the existence of overlapping analogues to it that are now lost. It was certainly just such chronicles that prompted the next step in the development of the genre.

Eratosthenes (c. 285–194 BC) was tutor to the children of Ptolemy III Euergetes (r. 246–241) and later head of the Alexandrian Library from c. 245. He was also a polymath of formidable breadth, only half-jokingly described as a scholarly *pentathlos* by contemporary rivals.<sup>74</sup> At some point around 222 BC, he composed the first carefully researched, detailed universal chronology of Greek history, which he called *Περὶ χρονογραφιῶν* (*On Time Writings*).<sup>75</sup> His influences were many and varied, perhaps inevitably so given the growing ecumenism of the Hellenistic world from the late fourth century onwards. Eratosthenes was presumably building upon the earlier development of the chronicle genre from the end of the fourth century, exemplified for us by Demetrius and the Parian Marble, but no doubt including many other works that no longer survive, particularly the Olympiad chronicle of Philochorus and perhaps that of Ctesicles.<sup>76</sup> The *Περὶ χρονογραφιῶν* began with the Trojan War, placed in the year we would now call 1184–1183 BC (860 years before the death of Alexander in 323 BC and 407 years before the first Olympiad in 776 BC), and continued down to Alexander. Eratosthenes used Olympiads as a unifying chronological system, a device he borrowed from Timaeus of Tauromenium, a Sicilian historian of the early third century.<sup>77</sup> In Eratosthenes’

<sup>74</sup> Pfeiffer 1968: 152–70 sets Eratosthenes in the context of his contemporaries.

<sup>75</sup> *FgrHist*, 241 F 1–3, 9–15, with *FgrHistK*, 704–13 and Pownall’s commentaries on the same fragments in *BNJ* and his biographical essay; Niese 1888b; *RE*, 1. vi. 1, 358–88, esp. pp. 381–82 (Knaack); *DNP*, iv, 44–47 (Tosi); Fraser 1970: 198–200 = 1971: 26–28; Geus 2002: 309–32; Feeney 2007: 19; Christesen 2007: 11–13, 174–75. Some comments on the development of universal history in the Hellenistic world can be found in ‘Chapter 2, note 75’ in the Appendices to the Footnotes, p. 363 below.

<sup>76</sup> For these two, generally accepted as the earliest known Olympiad chroniclers, see Christesen 2007: 25–26, 304–09, and for the text of the exiguous surviving fragments, see pp. 415–16 (= *FgrHist*, 328 T 1 and *FgrHist*, 245 F 1–3). For further discussion of these chroniclers, see ‘Chapter 2, note 76’ in the Appendices to the Footnotes, pp. 363–64 below.

<sup>77</sup> For Timaeus’s work, see ‘Appendix 1, note 9’ in the Appendices to the Footnotes, pp. 378–79 below. For Eratosthenes’ date for the fall of Troy, see most easily Kokkinos 2009: 45 n. 29, though he fails to realize that in each case his starting years are Macedonian years as well, i.e. 324–323 and 777–776 BC, which also give a Macedonian 1184–1183 (from autumn to autumn), not a Roman 1183, as he believes. For the dating of the fall of Troy, see Burkert 1995, Panchenko 2000, Feeney 2007: 81–84, and Kokkinos 2009. For Timaeus’s work with Olympiads, see Christesen 2007: 24–26, 277–89, 408–09.

opinion, everything before the Trojan War was fundamentally mythical and history could only be considered as accurate after the first Olympiad (776 BC). In pursuit of chronological accuracy, he compiled his own list of Olympic victors, the Ὀλυμπιονίκαι (*Olympic Victors*), before setting out to compose the Περὶ χρονογραφῶν.<sup>78</sup> Eratosthenes' work gave the chronicle respectability and authority within the Greek intellectual world, and his chronology became the yardstick against which all later Greek chronologies were measured.<sup>79</sup>

Eratosthenes' greatest influence was upon Apollodorus, a chronographer who used both the Alexandrian library and the equally impressive library of Pergamon to research his Χρονικά (*Chronica*), a work based on Eratosthenes, other chroniclers and historians, and considerable original research.<sup>80</sup> It covered the period from the Trojan War down to 146 BC, and included the same mixture of mythological and historical material as we have seen in Near Eastern chronicles and earlier Greek chronographic works.<sup>81</sup> The most unusual aspect of Apollodorus's work is the fact that it was written entirely in iambic trimeters, a metre that is especially easy to memorize.<sup>82</sup> Apollodorus came originally from Athens and this may explain

<sup>78</sup> For Eratosthenes' Olympiad researches, see Christesen 2007: 11–13, 19–20, 173–79, and for the text of extant fragments, pp. 371–73 (= *FgrHist*, 241 F 4–8, 11, 14, 15, 44). For a discussion of Eratosthenes and the synchronization of the first Olympiad with the equivalent of 776 BC, see 'Chapter 2, note 78' in the Appendices to the Footnotes, p. 364 below.

<sup>79</sup> Clement of Alexandria still quotes Eratosthenes' chronologies at the beginning of the third century AD (*Stromata*, 1. 138), as does Eusebius at the beginning of the fourth (*Chron. can.*, 66<sup>a</sup>), 550 years later. Indeed, Eratosthenes' date for the fall of Troy (1184–1183 BC) is still preserved in Eusebius (slightly altered to 1183–1182). Through Jerome, that date was passed on to the medieval West and the first scholarly chronographers of modern times, like Joseph Scaliger (1629: 379c, d).

<sup>80</sup> *FgrHist*, 244 F 1–87, 331–51, with *FgrHistK*, 716–52, 802–11. See Jacoby 1902; *RE*, 1.1.2, 2855–86, esp. pp. 2856–63 (Schwartz); *DNP*, 1, 857–60 (Montanari); Pfeiffer 1968: 255–61; Dorandi 1982; Feeney 2007: 19–20; and Christesen 2007: 13.

<sup>81</sup> As Wiseman 1979: 158, puts it: 'Apollodorus' conception of history was the amalgam of mythology, geography, and history (in our sense) that had been orthodox ever since Hecataeus and Hellanicus, with the characteristically Hellenistic data on philosophers and literary figures [...] dramatists, epic and elegiac poets, historians, and medical writers.' Wiseman's characterization of Apollodorus is in fact true of the whole chronicle genre, for we see it in the Parian Marble, the Chronicon Romanum, Phlegon, and Eusebius, who provides his own list in the preface to his *Chronographia*: 'die Heerführer, die Weisen, die Helden, die Dichter, die Geschichtschreiber, die Philosophen' (p. 1.9–11).

<sup>82</sup> See Jacoby 1902: 60–74, a chapter he calls, 'Der didaktische Iambus'. Cf. the American children's rhyme, 'In fourteen hundred and ninety-two | Columbus sailed the ocean blue', an iambic dimeter.

why he discarded Eratosthenes' use of Olympiads as the basis of his chronology. Instead, he used Athenian archons, presumably under the influence of Demetrius's Ἀρχόντων ἀναγραφή and similar works in the *Atthis* tradition, although it is possible that metrical reasons dictated his use of archons.<sup>83</sup>

Nevertheless, later prose reworkings and epitomes of Apollodorus reintroduced the by-then familiar Olympic framework to his text. These reworked versions of Apollodorus were continued, in one case at least for another thirty-five years (see Appendix 7.2, below), and became more widely known and popular than any other chronicle or chronographic work, including the original works of Eratosthenes and Apollodorus themselves. Only in the mid-first century BC were the reworked versions of Apollodorus superseded by the six books of the Olympiad chronicle of Castor of Rhodes, probably called Ἐπιτομὴ χρονικῶν (*An Epitome of (various) Chronicles*).<sup>84</sup> Castor relied on both Eratosthenes and Apollodorus, but he covered a broader span of Greek, Roman, and particularly 'Syrian' history (as Julius Africanus says, *Chronographiae*, F 34.32 = *FgrHist*, 250 F 7). His Olympiad chronicle ran from Ninus, king of Assyria, in c. 2060 BC, and Aegialeus, first king of Sicyon (and thus first king in Greece), in c. 2090 BC, all the way to 61 BC.<sup>85</sup>

<sup>83</sup> Feeney 2007: 20 raises the practical point that “*epi/ep* so-and-so [in the genitive]” scans much more easily than “in the third year of the seventeenth Olympiad”.

<sup>84</sup> Eusebius and later John Lydus call it the Ἐπιτομὴ χρονικῶν ('Kurzgefaßte Buch der Zeitgeschichten', 'Kurzgefaßte Buch', 'Zeiten-Bücher', 'Kurze Abriß', 'Geschichts-Abriß', and 'kurzge-drängte Abriß der Zeiten' in Karst's German translation of the Armenian translation of Eusebius's *Chronographia* (pp. 26.8–9, 11; 81.12, 13; 85.28; 142.19)). However Ps-Apollodorus and the *Suda* simply call it Χρονικά (cf. *FgrHist*, 250 F 1, 2, 2a, 4 with T 1, F 8). The 'Lindian Chronicle', a Rhodian inscription set up in 99 BC (*FgrHist/BNJ*, 532 (Higbie) and Higbie 2003), is not a chronicle ('chronicle' is the erroneous title given to it by its first editor) and so is not treated here: see Higbie 2003: 159. Likewise, Christesen 2007 includes Diodorus Siculus and Dionysius of Halicarnassus as Olympiad chroniclers of this period, as well as Dexippus in the third century AD, but they are far too long and expository to be considered chronicles according to any definition other than that of Christesen himself (see Chapter 1, note 34). For other less-known chroniclers (or possible chroniclers) of this and the following periods, see Appendix 1.

<sup>85</sup> *FgrHist*, 250 with *FgrHistK*, 814–26; *RE*, 1. x. 2, 2347–57 (Kubitschek); *DNP*, vi, 325 (Geus); Mosshammer 1979: 100, 129–31, 135, 144–46, 167, 182–83; Feeney 2007: 20, 63–64; Christesen 2007: 295, 311–22, 418–32. Castor seems to have written two chronological works, the Olympiad chronicle proper, the Ἐπιτομὴ χρονικῶν/Χρονικά, and something called the Κανών (*Kanon*; *FgrHist*, F 1 and 1a), the title of which may be related to the χρονικοὶ κανόνες ('chronological tables') referred to by Plutarch (*Solon*, 27. 1, quoted just below). This suggests that it was more of a collection of lists and chronologies than a full blown chronicle. The difference between the accepted inception date of Castor's chronicle and those offered here is explained in 'Chapter 2, note 85' in the Appendices to the Footnotes, pp. 364–65 below.

Even so, as is obvious from the many citations to and quotations from Apollodorus in both Greek and Latin — at the end of the second century AD Aulus Gellius called him ‘scriptor celebratissimus’ (see Appendix 1 note 10, below) — it was the *Chronica* that was later regarded as the ‘gold standard’ in chronological matters. This was so much so, in fact, that its title, *Χρονικά*, ‘chronicle’, was used by many other authors and it eventually became the generic term for that kind of history (as described in detail in Appendix 1 below), just as we have seen in the modern world with ‘aspirin’, ‘heroin’, ‘kleenex’, ‘coke’, and ‘zipper’.

Olympiad chronicles like Castor’s had a long vogue, with important examples attested as late as the second and third centuries AD. At the end of the first century AD Plutarch could claim that thousands of writers (μυρίοι, literally ‘tens of thousands’) were correcting what he calls ‘χρονικοί τινες λεγόμενοι κανόνες’ (‘those things called chronological tables’; *Solon*, 27. 1), a phrase that seems to refer to collections of regnal-year tables, the sort of thing we see in the Leipzig Chronograph, Africanus, Eusebius’s *Chronographia*, Syncellus, and many Byzantine chronological compendia.<sup>86</sup>

Phlegon of Tralles, a freedman of Hadrian probably writing just after AD 138, began the fifteen or sixteen books of his well-known chronicle, *Ὀλυμπιονικῶν καὶ χρονικῶν συναγωγὴ* (*Collection of Olympic Victors and Chronicles*), with the first Olympiad (776 BC) and concluded with the two hundred and twenty-ninth (AD 137–40).<sup>87</sup> Cassius Longinus, author of the last attested pagan Olympiad

<sup>86</sup> Syncellus uses a similar expression, though the noun is κανόνιον: ‘τούτου δὲ μνήμην αἱ θεῖαι γραφαὶ οὐ ποιοῦνται, οὐδὲ ἐν χρονικοῖς κανονίοις αὐτὸν οἱ πολλοὶ τάττουσιν’ (*Ed. chron.*, p. 269.12–14; ‘Divine scriptures make no mention of this, and most historians do not list him in chronological tables’; Adler and Tuffin 2002: 330). He says earlier, ‘μοι πάσα σπουδὴ γέγονε τόδε τὸ χρονικὸν συντάξαι κανονικῶς τε καὶ ἐξηγητικῶς’ (p. 1.20–22; ‘I have made every effort to arrange the chronology presented here with tables and explanations’; Adler and Tuffin 2002: 1). The Leipzig Chronograph is a chronological text of unknown date that survives on five fragmentary pieces of papyrus written between AD 100 and 150. Although its editors call it the Leipziger Weltchronik, it is not a chronicle by our definition, but rather a chronograph. It is divided into two parts. The first is a selection of important mythological and historical events covering roughly 850 years down to the early sixth century BC, spread over slightly more than two columns of text. Its chronology simply counts the number of years between each event. The second part contains a Babylonian and an Egyptian king list. It is described in Appendix 6 and translated in Appendix 4.3, below.

<sup>87</sup> *FgrHist*, 257 F1–34, with *FgrHistK*, 837–44; *RE*, 1. xx. 1, 261–64, esp. pp. 262–63 (Eva Frank); *DNP*, ix, 906 (Schmidt); Hansen 1996: 20–22, 58–62, 190–98; Christesen 2007: 326–34, text, 437–44. But note that *FgrHist*, 257a is not a fragment of Phlegon (in spite of the original editor’s claims); that *FgrHist*, 258 is a second-century AD fragment of an archon list — the

chronicle, perhaps wrote between 253 and 268.<sup>88</sup> The events of a single Olympiad from Phlegon's chronicle are quoted in Photius's *Bibliotheca*, and nothing of Longinus's text remains, which rather limits our understanding of the genre's later developments.<sup>89</sup> However, if the transmitted book totals are anything to go by (fifteen or sixteen for Phlegon and eighteen for Longinus), the genre was far exceeding its earlier limits.<sup>90</sup> This kind of genre-bending will be discussed below. Nevertheless, although we have no evidence for the composition of secular Olympiad chronicles after Longinus, the form remained popular into the third century AD. A papyrus fragment of an Olympiad chronicle, found at Oxyrhynchus and covering events between the 106th and the 116th Olympiad (356–353 to 316–313 BC), was copied between AD 200 and 250. The date at which this fragmentary chronicle was originally composed is unclear: that it dates to not long after the beginning of the imperial period is nothing more than a guess.<sup>91</sup> There is another very fragmentary Olympiad chronicle from Oxyrhynchus that covers Greek history at the very beginning of the second century BC and was copied in the second half of the second century AD, but it is too fragmentary for us to offer any useful comment here.<sup>92</sup>

last of the archons for life and the first of the ten-year archons down to 693 BC — no doubt from a chronograph, not a chronicle (see *BNJ*, 258 (Stronk)); and that Porphyry (*FgrHist*, 260) never wrote a chronicle: Croke 1983b and Janiszewski 2006: 403–11. See Christesen 2007: 519–31 for other attempts to link other fragmentary texts to Phlegon. For a number of other works not considered here, see 'Chapter 2, note 87' in the Appendices to the Footnotes, p. 365 below.

<sup>88</sup> *FgrHist/BNJ*, 259 (Benferhat), with *FgrHistK*, 853–54. For the identity of Cassius Longinus, see Appendix 7.2 below.

<sup>89</sup> Photius, *Bibliotheca*, cod. 97 = *FgrHist*, 257 F 12 = Christesen 2007: 440–41, of which there is a translation in Appendix 4.5 below. There is also a translation and commentary in Hansen 1996: 61–62, 195–98 and a translation in Christesen 2007: 329–30. For Photius, see Dickey 2007: 103–04.

<sup>90</sup> Phlegon covered a minimum of seven hundred years in books one to five (from at least 776 down to 69 BC, where Photius may imply the book ended), thus about 140 years per book on average, which is very much on the scale of a chronicle like Castor's, but the remaining ten books covered just over two hundred years, for an average of twenty years per book, which is very much less like a chronicle's normal long coverage. This can be explained if the title we have for his work is correct, and it was a compilation of other chronicles.

<sup>91</sup> *POxy*, I 12 (with commentary); *FgrHist*, 255, with *FgrHistK*, 831–34; Johanson 1979; Christesen 2007: 337–40, text, 448–51. The fragment itself covers the years 355–354 to 316–315. There is a translation of the entire surviving portion of this chronicle in Appendix 4.4, below.

<sup>92</sup> *POxy*, XVII 2082 (with introduction and commentary). See Christesen 2007: 334–36 (with translation) and 445–47 (text); *FgrHist*, 257a, with *FgrHistK*, 848–53.



Many other works that may or may not have been actual chronicles are attested only by their titles. We cannot place them meaningfully within the history of the genre, but in tandem with the more or less precisely dated chronicles discussed in this chapter they are very useful for establishing the history of the nomenclature of chronographic genres in antiquity. In particular, they help us understand why some version of the word 'chronicle' became the dominant Greek and Latin title for the sort of works treated in this volume. That history, relying largely on long lists of titles whose contents are wholly lost, is presented in Appendix 1. Here, we may turn from the Hellenistic chronicle to the Latin genre which Roman authors modelled on Greek precedents.

### *The First Latin Chronicles: Nepos and Atticus*

The earliest evidence for chronicles in Latin comes from the end of the republic, when Apollodorus's Greek chronicle and its later reworkings had become well enough known in Rome to inspire Romanized, Latin versions.<sup>93</sup> The late republican biographer Cornelius Nepos (c. 110–24 BC) and Cicero's friend T. Pomponius Atticus (110–32 BC) both wrote chronological works, seemingly in imitation of Apollodorus's *Chronica*. Nepos's *Chronica* was a universal chronicle in three books, probably written in the early 50s BC or earlier, while Atticus's *Liber annalis* was a chronicle of Roman history in one book, written between 50 and 46. These two works, along with the shadowy *Liber annalis* of L. Scribonius Libo and the three-book *Annales* of M. Terentius Varro, will be treated at greater length in Volume II and so we shall not expand on these descriptions any further.

Like most of Latin literature, Latin chronicles were based upon Greek models. For a Latin chronicle tradition to grow beyond mere imitation or translation, an exact chronology that synchronized Greek and Roman history was necessary. Before Nepos and Atticus there was no real understanding of how Roman history related to Greek history. Late republican antiquarianism grew up in part out of this new need for a precise understanding of the Roman past. This antiquarianism, which reached its apogee in the works of M. Terentius Varro, caused a revolution in how the Romans understood their own history and the way it related to that of other cultures and civilizations.<sup>94</sup> It is difficult to exaggerate the scale of the changes

<sup>93</sup> See Wiseman 1979: 157 n. 19 and Decreas 1984: 850 n. 37. Aulus Gellius knew Apollodorus in the original Greek verse version (*NA*, 17. 4. 5–6).

<sup>94</sup> See, e.g., Rawson 1985: 233–49.

implied by this new understanding, as just a few comparisons will show. In the last quarter of the second century BC, the historian L. Calpurnius Piso Censorius Frugi (cos. 133, cens. 120) and many others accepted that Numa Pompilius, the second king of Rome, now traditionally dated to the late eighth and early seventh centuries BC, had been a devotee or even pupil of Pythagoras, a Greek philosopher who lived in the second half of the sixth century BC.<sup>95</sup> Even more remarkably, as late as the second quarter of the first century BC the historian C. Licinius Macer (d. 66) could write an account of a Roman embassy that travelled to Syracuse to meet the famous Sicilian tyrant Dionysius in 492 BC, about sixty years before Dionysius was actually born.<sup>96</sup> And, surprisingly enough, this ignorance was true even of the recent history of the Romans themselves.<sup>97</sup> Yet less than a generation later, as we saw in note 95,

<sup>95</sup> Piso, frag. 11 (= frag. 13, Chassignet 1999: 25). See also Valerius Antias, frag. 9 (= frag. 10, Chassignet 2004: 108), also of Piso but apparently misattributed to Antias by Livy (see *HRR*, I, pp. cxcii–cxci). The origins of the story are unknown, but early: some (e.g. Garbarino 1973: 227–29, 237, Gruen 1990: 160–62) have brought the Greek Pythagorean writer Aristoxenus into the argument (Wehrli 1967b: fr. 17, of c. 300), but he in fact says nothing about Numa. What may have been only a vague inkling of a connection between these two men seems to have been made quite concrete to contemporaries by the supposed discovery, in 181 BC, of Pythagorean ‘books of Numa’ in Numa’s coffin. From that point onwards, no mere chronological argument could put a stake through the heart of this legend: see Gruen 1990: 158–70. For this whole question of Numa, Pythagoras, and the lost books that were rediscovered in 181 BC, see Cicero, *De re publica*, 2. 15. 28–29 (who dates Pythagoras’s arrival to year four of Tarquinius Superbus, the seventh and last king of Rome, in Olympiad 62 (= 532/31–529/28 BC), from Apollodorus via Nepos; this also appears in his *Tusculan Disputations*, 1. 38); Livy 1. 18. 2 (who dates him to the reign of Servius Tullius, the sixth king of Rome, now traditionally 578–535 BC); Livy 40. 29. 2–14; Pliny, *Historia naturalis*, 13. 84–87; and Plutarch, *Numa*, 1 and 22 (= Cassius Hemina, frag. 37 (= frag. 40, Chassignet 1999: 14–15); Tuditanus, frag. 3 (= frag. 7, Chassignet 1999: 43); and Antias, frags 7–9 and 15 (= frags 9–10, 16, Chassignet 2004: 108, 111)); with Chassignet 1999: 108–10 and Frier 1979: 108 n. 2. Varro also mentioned the story in book seven of his *Antiquities*, according to Pliny and Augustine, *De ciuitate dei*, 7. 34. See in particular Garbarino 1973: 53–62 (nos 1–20, ancient testimonies on Numa and Pythagoras), 64–69 (nos 26–37, testimonies on ‘the books of Numa’), and 221–58 (analysis).

<sup>96</sup> Frag. 12 (= frag. 13, Chassignet 2004: 95), no doubt influenced by earlier annalists like Cn. Gellius, frag. 20 (= frag. 20, Chassignet 1999: 78).

<sup>97</sup> Zetzel 2007: 10–11: ‘It would not do to forget not only how little we know about the literary history of the early second century BCE, but also how little even scholars of the second half of the second century knew about their predecessors. Accius, we might remember, had a totally different chronology for Livius Andronicus and thus for all early Roman poetry. It was not until the work of Nepos, Atticus, and Varro in the 50s and 40s BCE that any firm chronology of Roman events and writers could be established.’

Cicero (and later Livy) could correctly date Pythagoras in relation to the Roman kings (almost certainly as a result of Nepos) and Nepos could correctly state that Tullus Hostilius and Archilochus were roughly contemporaries.<sup>98</sup> The advance in knowledge implied in that generational shift is nothing short of revolutionary: with Nepos and Atticus, it had for the first time become possible to establish chronological connections across differing systems of historical reckoning, and Cicero could laugh at those who had once believed in the stories of Numa and Pythagoras.<sup>99</sup>

Along with the new chronographic writings, the late republic also witnessed a renewed interest in the writing of annalistic classicizing history after a gap of about a generation following C. Fannius. These late republican historians — Q. Claudius Quadrigarius, C. Licinius Macer, Valerius Antias, Q. Aelius Tubero, and T. Livius (better known to us as Livy) — all tried in different ways to distinguish themselves from their predecessors: Macer and Tubero made use of new sources (the mysterious ‘Linen Rolls’ referred to by Livy in his discussion of his rivals); Quadrigarius began his history in 386 after attacking and abandoning the evidence of the records of the pontifex maximus; Tubero may have attempted a Thucydidean style; Antias and Livy wrote histories on a scale beyond anything their predecessors could have imagined. It would all culminate in the publication of a massive text called the *Annales maximi* in eighty books, sometime early in the reign of Augustus.<sup>100</sup> The late republic, then, witnessed a period of intense historiographical experimentation, and the chronographic works of Nepos and Atticus need to be seen as a part of this larger context.<sup>101</sup>

To Romans of the last century of the republic, the works of Nepos and Atticus offered one great advantage that no Roman had ever had: the ability to see history

<sup>98</sup> Nepos, *Chronica*, frag. 7. Hostilius was king in the first half of the seventh century and Archilochus was active in the second half, as we now know. But Archilochus’s well-known mention of Gyges (frag. 19 (ed. by West 1989) and Herodotus 1. 12), who was a contemporary of Hostilius, was probably the chronological key, as it was for modern scholarship until recently.

<sup>99</sup> Of course, at the dramatic date of the *De re publica* (129 BC) the story would not have been doubted by Cicero’s interlocutors.

<sup>100</sup> This Augustan work of reconstruction would be the last great monument of annalistic republican history: see Frier 1979: 39–67, 179–200, Frier 1999: xv–xviii, and Wiseman 2007: 238. All this evidence will be discussed in greater detail in Volume II. These are the *Annales maximi* that medievalists so often — and incorrectly — refer to as antecedents of medieval annals.

<sup>101</sup> See Rawson 1985: 244–47 for Nepos and Atticus in the context of late republican chronological antiquarianism and Geiger 2008: 36–48, esp. p. 36: ‘The activity of the near-contemporaries Varro, Nepos and Atticus reflects the new historical consciousness of the end of the republic — a *Zeitgeist* whose importance cannot be exaggerated.’ See also note 97, above.

*uno in conspectu*, as Cicero had put it (*Brutus*, 15). As noted in our consideration of genre in Chapter 1, classicizing history was long and detailed: Antias wrote in at least seventy-five, and perhaps one hundred, books; Livy wrote one hundred and forty; and the *Annales maximi* were in eighty. In works of such scale and structure, the casual reader could neither distinguish relative chronologies nor find the dates of specific historical events. Annalistic narrative histories were meant to be read, not used. With Atticus's chronicle one could, for the first time, see the history of Rome unfold in a simple and easily digested fashion. The addition of *ab urbe condita* ('from the foundation of the city', AUC) dates every decade made it simple to find particular events and to determine relative chronologies in a way that had never been possible before.<sup>102</sup>

Cicero discovered this quickly: in the *Brutus* and the *Cato* he visibly delights in hopscotching across the years, noting that event A happened thirty years after event B, and that the consulship of C and D was nine years after the consulship of E and F, which was eighty-six years before his own consulate or 514 years after the foundation of the city.<sup>103</sup> That sort of historical play was impracticable with the typical classicizing history of the day, but not with the practical history which the chronicle represented. And since Roman classicizing history was fundamentally and hopelessly parochial in its outlook, it was simply impossible for a reader to relate what he was reading to what was happening anywhere else in the Mediterranean at the time. As a genre, it was designed for those who wanted to use it, not sit and read it as a piece of literature. We must keep that fact in mind when evaluating Cicero's disparaging remarks about 'annals' (see Appendix 2). Annals were histories, with all the connotations of completeness and literary elevation that that word entailed: as histories, they failed to meet the criteria normally expected from the genre. A chronicle, on the other hand, was something different, a practical tool, not a piece of literature, and so was clearly to be judged according to a different set of standards. It is a lesson that modern historians would do well to remember.

<sup>102</sup> This approach was even taken a step further by Augustus's Roman 'hall of fame' in his new forum of 2 BC, which was populated by statues of famous Romans with short inscribed *elogia*, a kind of three-dimensional chronicle of Roman history. As Geiger says, 'the medium chosen to communicate the ideas of Augustus was a medium suited to much broader segments of the population than those that could be reached by the means of literary works, even if eventually elevated to the status of national epic' (2008: 64). For the use of the visual arts as a means of educating the Roman public, the meaning of 'education' in this context, and the importance of the works of Atticus, Nepos, and Varro as the models upon which the choice of these statues was made, see Geiger 2008: 70–85.

<sup>103</sup> See Volume II for a reconstruction of Atticus based on Cicero, as well as the important discussion of Feeney 2007: 25–28.

### *Other Early Latin Chronicles*

The so-called *Chronicon Romanum* belongs in the same context as the written works of Nepos and Atticus, even though it is an epigraphic chronicle written in Greek in AD 15/16.<sup>104</sup> It belongs in a discussion of Roman chronicles, rather than standing alongside the Greek chronicles of Castor, Phlegon, and Cassius Longinus discussed above, because it was probably compiled by a Latin-speaking individual and it eschewed the Olympiad chronology dominant in Hellenistic chronicles.<sup>105</sup> Instead, like the Parian Marble it uses what must have been at the time a very old-fashioned countdown chronology calculated to the date of writing. The chronicler's conceptual debt to his Greek forebears (chiefly Apollodorus) was such that he wrote in Greek, much as Q. Fabius Pictor and L. Cincius Alimentus had written the first Roman histories in Greek, but the local Roman perspective is unmistakable all the same. A single fragment of the chronicle survives, preserving two columns of text. One contains an almost annual account of Roman and Egyptian history between 88 and 80 BC. The other is a selection of historical events covering Athenian, Lydian, Persian, and Roman political and literary history from the sixth to the fourth century BC, including notices of rulers like Darius, sages like Pythagoras, and historians like Thucydides, as well as a reference to the Gallic sack of Rome that corroborates Greek, rather than traditional Roman, chronologies, a fundamental indication of Greek sources.<sup>106</sup>

Our only further evidence for an early Latin chronicle must be derived from two consularia of the fourth and fifth centuries AD, the *Descriptio consulum* and the *Consularia Vindobonensia*, and is for that reason discussed at greater length in Volume II. For the most part, both texts offer bare fasti for the middle and late republic. However, between 112 and 16 BC, both suddenly produce a typically

<sup>104</sup> *FgrHist*, 252, with *FgrHistK*, 827–29 = *IG*, XIV, no. 1297 (p. 349). A complete translation appears in Appendix 4.2.

<sup>105</sup> The mother tongue of the compiler can be determined by the fact the name Praeneste is spelled as if it were Latin (ΠΡΑΕΝΕΣΤΟΙ) not Greek (ΠΡΑΙΝΕΣΤΟΙ). As the editor of *IG* says, 'lapidarius igitur Romanus', though he should have said 'auctor igitur Romanus': if it had been only the stonemason, he would hardly have even recognized the name in Greek and changed it.

<sup>106</sup> Other figures mentioned are Solon, Anacharsis, Croesus, the Seven Sages, Pisistratus, Aesop, Cyrus, Cambyses, Harmodius, Aristogiton, Hipparchus, Xerxes, Themistocles, Socrates, Heraclitus, Anaxagoras, Parmenides, and Zeno. The Gallic sack is dated 401 years before the time of writing, which agrees with the Greek dating of the event (387/86 BC), rather than the Roman date (390 BC). Despite all the many modern scholarly discussions of the chronology of the Gallic sack, this evidence has never to our knowledge been cited (usually only Polybius 1. 6. 1, who gives three synchronisms, is cited, sometimes along with Justin, *Epitoma Pompei Trogi*, 20. 5. 1–6).

Hellenistic mélange of literary and historical data.<sup>107</sup> As will be demonstrated in Volume II, this material was excerpted and added to plain fasti at some date in or before 161, but the very fact of that excerpting implies the existence of an earlier chronicle along the lines of the earlier works of Nepos and Atticus: republican history *uno in conspectu*.

### *Augustan and Imperial Developments*

Roman chronography sprang up suddenly in the last century of the republic, its utility and importance promptly recognized by an astute observer like Cicero. Yet this early flowering withered quickly. Manuscript chronicles like those of Nepos and Atticus were more or less the first and the last of their kind. In fact, a Hellenistic-style chronicle would not be written in Latin again until the very end of the fourth century AD, when Jerome translated, augmented, and continued the Greek *Chronici canones* of Eusebius of Caesarea in 380–81, essentially importing the continuous Greek tradition to the West for a second time.<sup>108</sup> There is no obvious explanation why this method of writing history should have had so short a life in Latin. Antiquarianism after Verrius Flaccus (d. c. AD 20) was given more to the compilation of existing antiquarian writing than original research, so perhaps it was felt that Nepos and Atticus (and any followers) could not be improved upon.<sup>109</sup> That was certainly the case with other technical genres — for instance grammatical or veterinary textbooks — that ceased to be written once seemingly definitive examples had been produced. A new taste for *breviaria* ('pocket' histories, as we would now call them) and epitomes may also have played a part. These began to become popular from the start of the imperial period when the *breviaria* of L. Ateius Philologus and Velleius Paterculus appeared, while the first epitomes of Livy date to the time of

<sup>107</sup> This block of text includes the Jugurthine War, the birth and death of Cicero, the birth and death of Sallust, the birth and death of Vergil, the Catilinarian conspiracy, the appearance of three suns (a parhelion), the Isaurian War (?), the assassination of Caesar, Octavian proclaimed Augustus, a slave war (i.e. the revolt of Lepidus in 36 BC), the discovery of the orbit of the moon, the freedom of Carthage (the Punic town), and the opening of the Aqua Virgo.

<sup>108</sup> See Volume III.

<sup>109</sup> Cornell 1995: 21–22. Certainly that is what happened with Hellenistic scholarship after its main flowering in the third century BC: see Pfeiffer 1968: 252–79. Nepos (with or without a continuation?) was still being read in the 370s when Ausonius sent a copy to the praetorian prefect Sextus Petronius Probus (Ausonius, *Ep.* 9; R. Green 1991: 201 and 619) and Castor was a familiar (and metrical) name that Ausonius used when he wanted the name of a chronicler that his audience would recognize (*Professores*, 22. 7; R. Green 1991: 57 and 360).

Martial, in the late first century, if not earlier.<sup>110</sup> It may be that these abbreviated narratives were seen as appropriate replacements for chronicles. Perhaps indicating as much, the third-century Oxyrhynchus epitome of Livy (*POxy*, IV 668) is set up exactly like a chronicle, with consuls as lemmata heading up short précis of Livy's narrative.<sup>111</sup> If all Livy were lost, depriving us of comparanda, we might actually think of the Oxyrhynchus papyrus as a kind of chronicle, though its Romano-centric content would still be unusual: chronicles appear to have been much more ecumenical than most other forms of Latin history. This general preference for abridgement and epitome of existing works may well account for the disappearance of the chronicle as a literary genre after Nepos and Atticus. It does not, however, account for the disappearance of epigraphic chronicles, to be discussed in Chapter 4, and the whole question must really remain open.

Before Jerome, only one other extant Latin work even resembles a chronicle. That is the *Breviarium Vindobonense*, or *Chronica urbis Romae*, to give the work the conventional name assigned to it by Mommsen. This bizarre compendium is usually thought to have been an original part of the *Chronograph of 354*, but it was not, as is demonstrated in Burgess 2012 and Volume II. A sketch of its extent and contents, not out of place here, will suggest how it relates to both earlier and later Latin chronographic works. The *Breviarium* is essentially a compendium of the rulers of the Roman people 'from the time at which they first began to rule in Italy'. The list thus begins with Picus, son of Saturn, and continues down to Ascanius. It then follows him with the kings of Alba Longa (a bare list with the exception of Postumus) and the seven kings of Rome. Instead of consuls it contents itself with a bare list of some so-called dictators in an exceedingly jumbled order. Thereafter, the bulk of the list is concerned with the emperors from Julius Caesar to Licinius. Constantine is conspicuous by his absence and so the work must have been completed before his death in 337. The length of each emperor's reign is given in years, months, and days (almost all wrong, though the figures between Gordian I and II and Probus are better than the rest), along with the amount of his donatives, if any, and the place of his death. To supplement these basic items, the compiler includes a variety of other information about each emperor, where available, usually building projects, but also disasters like riots and collapsing amphitheatres and oddities like the birth of a piglet that looked like an elephant. It is difficult to know

<sup>110</sup> For Ateius, an obscure figure from the time of Sallust, see *RE*, I. II. 2, 1910–11 (Goetz); *DNP*, II, 150 (Kaster); *OCD*, 200 (Kaster); on Velleius, *RE*, I. VIII. 1, 637–59 (Dihle); *DNP*, XII. 1, 1169–72 (Krapinger); *OCD*, 1585–86 (Woodman).

<sup>111</sup> See *HLL*, IV, § 464, pp. 337–38, and Volume II.

what sort of sources the compiler used or what sort of audience he was writing for, but one suspects that this type of ‘extreme epitome’ must have been common. As a subgenre, it played to a public fascination with the ‘tabloid’ aspects of history: monarchy, money, death, disaster, and the bizarre. In its brevity, its interest in certain fixed categories of material, and its style, the *Breviarium* does of course mirror a chronicle, and can in a way be compared to the later chronicle epitomes of Isidore and Bede. But it lacks an overall chronological structure, or even an interest in chronology, both of which are fundamental aspects of a chronicle. Nevertheless, in the years between the inscribed *Chronicon Romanum* and Jerome, the *Breviarium Vindobonense* and the Oxyrhynchus epitome of Livy are as close as surviving Latin literature comes to a chronicle, and we have therefore included a discussion and translation of both, the first in much more detail, in Volume II.<sup>112</sup>

Latin historiography changed forever in 379, when a western priest resident in Antioch came to a momentous decision. Jerome had been learning and studying Greek, and while in Antioch he came across a copy of Eusebius of Caesarea’s *Chronici canones* and its anonymous Antiochene continuation. Jerome had already begun to think about presenting Greek theological learning to a western audience and believed that the best way to do this was by means of translations of important Greek works. The first text he chose to translate was Eusebius’s *Canones*, and his estimate of its importance to western thought proved correct. Before we can turn to the impact of Jerome’s translation on the Latin West, however, we must return to the Greek world once again, for it was thence that Jerome’s revolution came.

Eusebius of Caesarea (260/65–30 May 339) stands among the most important scholars of the early church, Greek or Latin. Even giving all due consideration to his weighty theological tomes, his most influential and lasting contribution was in the field of history, for he both brought the Hellenistic Olympiad chronicle to its final fruition and almost single-handedly invented the genre of ecclesiastical history. His Χρονικὸὶ κανόνες (*Chronici canones* or *Chronological Tables*) was a brilliant and unique fusion of two distinct chronographic traditions, that of Hellenistic Greek Olympiad chronicles, which we discussed above, and that of Christian apologetic chronography, to which we turn in the next chapter.

<sup>112</sup> For the manuscript tradition of the *Chronograph of 354* and the proof that the *Breviarium* was not originally part of it, see Burgess 2012. Three Latin translations of a Greek work, traditionally said to be the *Chronica* of Hippolytus and known collectively as the *Liber generationis*, are also extant from the imperial period. As will be seen in Chapter 3, however, the *Liber* is merely an annotated collection of lists, and not a chronicle, and is not an original work in Latin. The poet Ausonius is also known to have written a chronicle, but we have no idea whether it was before or after Jerome’s *Chronici canones*: see Chapter 3, p. 128.



## APOLOGETIC CHRONOGRAPHY AND THE CHRONOGRAPHIC WORKS OF EUSEBIUS

Well before the time of Eusebius, chronology had come to be an important tool in the arsenal of Christian apologists, for it allowed Christians to claim chronological priority for their revelation and effectively ‘out-past’ their detractors.<sup>1</sup> Christian apologetic chronography, in turn, had its roots in a well-established tradition of Jewish apologetic, which had itself originated in the historical apologetics of the early Hellenistic period. The reader might be surprised by our use of the term ‘apologetics’ outside the Christian context in which it is most familiar. Nevertheless, the form and method of Christian apologetic is identical to the well-established ancient genre in which a member of one group or another defends the antiquity and legitimacy of his city or people.<sup>2</sup>

### *Cultural Apologetic in the Greek World*

The historiographical assumptions of the ancient world were almost the precise reverse of our own. Since the nineteenth century, and despite the upheavals that have taken place in Anglophone scholarship since the ‘linguistic turn’ of the 1970s,

<sup>1</sup> See the discussion of Zerubavel 2003: 105–09 for ‘out-pasting’ as an essential political function of chronology.

<sup>2</sup> The term ‘ethnic/cultural propaganda’ might work as an alternative description, but ‘propaganda’ implies that what is said is untrue and also known to be untrue by those who spread it, which is not a part of the word’s original meaning but a result of the way propaganda was used in the twentieth century. The Hellenistic and Jewish predecessors of Christian apologists certainly believed that their arguments were true and that they were mounting a truthful and legitimate defence (ἀπολογία) of their past, hence our preference for ‘historical/cultural apologetics’.

modern westerners have had a basically progressive view of history: the future will be better than the present, just as the present is better than the past, not just a chronological development out of it, but an evolutionary improvement upon it.<sup>3</sup> History may involve peaks and troughs, rises, declines, and falls, but these are nevertheless plotted along a gradually ascending line. Unlike us, the ancient world invariably privileged the past over the present: whatever was oldest was always the best, because it stood closer to the Golden Age, to the beginnings of all things, and to the gods. Because more distant from those beginnings, the present must necessarily be a declension from them, at worst an age of decadence: 'Nothing could be both new *and* true'.<sup>4</sup> Antiquity actually guaranteed truth. Naturally, the Greeks believed their own culture to be better than those of the 'barbarian' nations (βάρβαροι = non-Greek speakers) that surrounded them; as a necessary corollary, they presumed that their civilization predated any 'barbarian' civilization. Sadly, that belief became harder to maintain as the Greek world expanded into the Mediterranean. As Greeks came into contact with many barbarian cultures, they began to research and write about them, particularly from the fifth century BC. From an early date, the Greeks were aware of Egyptian claims to a very great antiquity, as both Herodotus and Plato show.<sup>5</sup> In general, and despite their affecting to believe in the Egyptian origins of much Greek learning, such claims were not taken all that seriously by the Greeks with their unshakeable sense of cultural superiority, and thus chronological priority.

Greek interest in other cultures led various authors to compose geographic, ethnographic, and historical accounts of foreign lands and peoples. Many of these became quite well known in the Greek-speaking world, even if they were poorly researched and badly written, like Ctesias's accounts of Persia and India.<sup>6</sup> Eventually, in response to the same impulses, in the years immediately following 340 BC Ephorus produced a thirty-book history of the eastern Mediterranean. This was the first 'universal' history in Greek, a genre given new currency by the conquests of Alexander, which brought many non-Greek, which is to say 'barbarian', territories firmly into the Greek world. Greek and Macedonian overlords brought Greek language, learning, and culture with them, and local elites were not always

<sup>3</sup> This does not apply to science fiction, which, apart from *Star Trek* and a few other exceptions, tends to see the distant future as more or less dystopian or apocalyptic: see Aldiss 1986.

<sup>4</sup> Droge 1989: 9. See also Young 1997: 49–57.

<sup>5</sup> Herodotus 2. 143 and Plato, *Timaeus*, 22–23.

<sup>6</sup> Lenfant 2004: xxiv–clvii; Parker 2008: 28–33 argues that Ctesias is very important in articulating the boundaries of truth and fiction in Greek historiography.

pleased with what they found in the newly dominant culture. In lands with their own proud and ancient pasts, Babylonians, Phoenicians, Egyptians, and Jews found that Greek knowledge about them was at best confused, lacunose, and prone to error; worse, they found that despite this ignorance, the Greeks still insisted on their own superiority in most human endeavours.

Plato may reflect Egyptian claims of an eight-thousand-year history in the *Timaeus*. He certainly put in the mouth of an Egyptian the oft-quoted claim that the Greeks were but children: 'Solon, Solon, you Greeks are always children; there's no such thing as an old Greek. You are all young in mind; you possess no old belief handed down by ancient traditions, nor any knowledge grown old and grey through the passing of time.'<sup>7</sup> But this magnanimous respect is not all that it appears to be. In the very same work, and in its sequel the *Critias*, Plato also claimed that the Athenians predated the Egyptians by a thousand years. Still more, he has the Egyptian priest who spoke the above words praise the Athenians highly and claim that, nine thousand years before Solon, the primitive Athenians had defended the eastern Mediterranean against invasion from Atlantis and then freed the west and south from earlier Atlantean domination.<sup>8</sup> Contemporary Athenian culture may not have been ancient, but whatever ancient culture the Egyptians had they owed to the actions of the childlike Athenians.

The universal chronicles that followed on from Ephorus played an important role in perpetuating this endemic cultural chauvinism of the Greeks. Through them, Greek ancestry could be shown to stretch back to the middle of the sixteenth century BC for Athens, the nineteenth century for Argos, and the twenty-first century for Sicyon.<sup>9</sup> Equally, the increasingly complex Peripatetic philosophy of the

<sup>7</sup> Plato, *Timaeus*, 22B: 'Ὁ Σόλων, Σόλων, Ἕλληνες αἰὲ παιδές ἐστε, γέρων δὲ Ἕλλην οὐκ ἔστιν. [...] Νέοι ἐστέ [...] τὰς ψυχὰς πάντες· οὐδεμίαν γὰρ ἐν αὐταῖς ἔχετε δι' ἀρχαίαν ἀκοήν παλαιὰν δόξαν οὐδὲ μάθημα χρόνῳ πολὺν οὐδέν.'

<sup>8</sup> Plato, *Timaeus*, 22B–25E (esp. 23C, 23D–E, 24C) and *Critias*, 108E, 112E (further praise of the primitive Athenians).

<sup>9</sup> Cecrops is dated to 1581–1580 BC by the Parian Marble and 1556 BC by Eusebius, which again proves the close link among their sources and the homogeneity of the general chronographic tradition involving Greece's distant past, which must therefore have achieved its common currency before 264/63 BC, the date of the engraving of the Parian Marble. Eusebius dates the first year of Inachus, first king of Argos, to 1856 BC and on the evidence of both the *Canones* and the *Chronographia*, the prolegomenon to the *Canones*, he dated the first year of Aegialeus, first king of Sicyon, to 2089 BC (a date he obtained from the Olympiad chronicler Castor of Rhodes). There were also unsuccessful attempts by Douris of Samos and Timaeus to move Greek history back even further (if only by two hundred years) by dating the fall of Troy exactly one thousand years before Alexander's crossing into Asia in 334 (Panchenko 2000: 35, 42–44 and Kokkinos 2009: 48).

late fourth and third centuries gave theoretical grounding to a Hellenocentric model of all human history, not least through a work like Dicaearchus's *Life of Greece*.<sup>10</sup>

Greek cultural hegemony followed rapidly on Alexander's conquests, and Greek histories and chronicles colonized the historical past in the same way that Greeks and Macedonians colonized territory in the present. As a result, however, some local writers were inspired to mount rearguard actions, not only to defend their own culture and history against Greek claims to chronological priority, but also to correct the many errors that Greek writers inflicted on local history. Because the main audience for these subaltern responses was the new Greek ruling elite, the texts were written in Greek, using Greek forms of discourse; it was, after all, a fundamentally Greek technique to call upon history and chronology in defence of cultural claims. These writers admitted the Greek achievement, thus conceding a major point of Greek historical discourse, but they then claimed it for themselves. Each writer could 'prove' his culture to be older than that of the Greeks, and since antiquity meant both priority and superiority, each could demonstrate that everything the Greeks prized had in fact been learned from 'barbarians'. Local and national writers would equally emphasize the importance of their history and heroes, filling their pages with great men and heroic exploits that influenced Mediterranean, and not just local, history.

Yet the claim to antiquity was paramount all the same. As Josephus would say much later, each nation tried to trace its own origin to the remotest antiquity so it could appear to be the benefactor of its neighbours rather than their imitator.<sup>11</sup> It was never allowed that two cultures could have stumbled upon important cultural developments independently and at different times: the progression was linear and whoever was the older was the originator and all those who came later were derivative. Julius Africanus tells us that the Egyptians claimed for themselves a history going back tens of thousands of years, the Phoenicians 30,000 years, and the Babylonians 480,000 years.<sup>12</sup> Even well into the Middle Ages, Greek historians

<sup>10</sup> Wehrli 1967a.

<sup>11</sup> Josephus, *Against Apion*, 2. 152. For an excellent summary of this development, see Bickerman 1980a: 347–51 and Droge 1989: 1–9, 195–96. Interestingly, the Romans did not share in this approach and wholeheartedly accepted the Greek view of the development of civilization; see Cornell 2010: 103–05.

<sup>12</sup> Africanus, *Chronographiae*, F 15 (p. 24). This can be confirmed in its general outlines by the Babylonian Royal Chronicle which assigns reigns of many tens of thousands of years to the first kings (Glassner 2004: 129). The Chronicle of the Single Monarchy allots 385,200 years to only eight antediluvian kings and assigns the immediately subsequent kings reigns of hundreds of years each (Glassner 2004: 121).

had a precise understanding of the purpose of such claims to historical antiquity. Syncellus, writing in the ninth century AD, could state that he was 'fully convinced that it was out of a desire to glorify the Chaldaean nation and to show that it was older than all the other nations that Berossos and his followers [...] have written these things'.<sup>13</sup> Historical apologetic thus arose in response to what might be called Greek cultural imperialism, particularly as it was disseminated in chronicles and other chronographic works. Because antiquity guaranteed priority, historical apologetic had to ground itself upon demonstrating the antiquity of a writer's own culture. This necessarily produced a genre whose foundations were laid by chronography.

### *Hecataeus, Manetho, Berossus, and their Contemporaries*

The earliest and most famous of these historical apologists were Hecataeus, Manetho, and Berossus, foot soldiers in a 'war of books between Hellenistic monarchies'.<sup>14</sup> This war of historical apologetics began in the fourth century BC and continued through to the fourth century AD.<sup>15</sup> It began with the appearance of Hecataeus of Abdera's *On the Egyptians*, written between 320 and 315 at the request of Ptolemy I Soter, satrap and later pharaoh of Egypt (r. 305–282 BC).<sup>16</sup> At the conclusion of his work, Hecataeus famously compared Greek and Egyptian civilizations and found the Egyptian more ancient and thus superior: Greek civilization was consequently derivative.<sup>17</sup> Hecataeus's work had a great influence on

<sup>13</sup> Translation from Adler and Tuffin 2002: 20 (= Syncellus, *Ed. chron.*, pp. 14.32–15.3). In general, Adler 1989: 50–71.

<sup>14</sup> O. Murray 1970: 166.

<sup>15</sup> Nor did it stop there; even as late as the end of the seventeenth century such arguments were still being made: Swedish historian and scientist Olof Rudbeck published a four-volume three-thousand page study called *Atlantica* (1679–89), in which he tried to prove that Gamla Uppsala (5 km north of the modern university town of Uppsala) was the capital of Atlantis and that all European culture and language therefore derived from Swedish roots. The frontispiece depicts him and Father Time presenting his conclusions to Hesiod, Plato, Aristotle, Apollodorus, Tacitus, Odysseus, Ptolemy, Plutarch, and Orpheus.

<sup>16</sup> *FgrHist*, 264 F 1–6, 25, with *FgrHistK*, 29–52, 75–87. For Hecataeus, see *RE*, 1. VII. 2, 2750–69 (Jacoby); *DNP*, v, 267 (Wandrey); O. Murray 1970 (including discussion of his influence on Artapanus, Manetho, and Berossus); Sterling 1992: 59–91; and *OCD*, 671 (Meister). For Hecataeus's influence on the Jewish writer Eupolemus (discussed below) in his interpretation of Moses, see Wacholder 1974: 85–96.

<sup>17</sup> See Diodorus Siculus, *Bibliotheca*, 1. 9. 3–4, 6 and 1. 96–98 (Hecataeus's original work no longer survives). He lists Orpheus, Musaeus, Melampus, Daedalus, Homer, Lycurgus, Solon, Plato,

later Hellenistic writers like Manetho, Berossus, Eupolemus, and Artapanus, and it became the standard Greek book on Egyptian history.<sup>18</sup>

Manetho was a high priest of Heliopolis, but educated in the new Greek ways. He wrote in Greek but used Egyptian sources, composing for Ptolemy I Soter a three-book history of Egypt (the *Aegyptiaca*) that extended from earliest mythic times down to 342 BC.<sup>19</sup> Following his sources, some of which we know to have been very ancient in origin, he divided Egyptian history into the thirty dynasties that still form the basis of Egyptian history to this day.

Like Manetho, Berossus was a priest and scholar educated in Greek as well as his native culture. As a servant of the god Bel-Marduk, he used Babylonian sources to write a three-book history of Babylonia in Greek. This *Babyloniaca* was dedicated to the Seleucid king Antiochus I Soter (r. 281–261 BC) and extended from Creation down to the time of Alexander the Great.<sup>20</sup> Unlike the Egyptian history of Hecataeus, the histories of Manetho and Berossus were almost completely ignored by later writers, even those with a visible interest in the subjects they treated. Our main source for the extant fragments of both authors comes from a compilation of the first century BC by Alexander Polyhistor and from later Christian citations from him.<sup>21</sup> Because of the influence of Polyhistor, later Christian apologists

Pythagoras, Eudoxus, Democritus of Abdera, Oenopides of Chios, and the sculptors Telecles and Theodorus as those who visited Egypt and derived their wisdom from the Egyptians.

<sup>18</sup> Indeed, so authoritative did this work become that a later Jewish author composed books on the Jews and attributed authorship to Hecataeus to gain authority for his work (though the whole matter is fraught with controversy). The author of these works is usually now referred to as Ps-Hecataeus: see Holladay 1983: 277–335.

<sup>19</sup> *FgrHist*, 609 F 1–12. For Manetho, see *RE*, 1. XIV. 1, 1060–1102 (Kind) and 1. XIV. 2, 2582 (Kroll); *DNP*, VII, 804–05 (Krauss); Waddell 1940: vii–xxvi; Sterling 1992: 117–36; *OCD*, 917 (Lloyd/Hopkinson); and Redford 2001, II, 108–09, 236, 336–37. For the date of Manetho and Berossus, see Adler 1989: 24–27. For a detailed analysis of Manetho's chronological data in the light of modern scholarship, see Redford 1986: 203–56, 282–83, 297–317, 331–32.

<sup>20</sup> *FgrHist*, 680 F 1–14 and the lengthy commentaries of De Breucker in *BNJ*, 680. For combined treatment of Berossus and Manetho, see Adler 1989: 24–42 and Verbrugghe and Wickersham 1996. For Berossus, *RE*, 1. III. 1, 309–16 (Schwartz); *DNP*, II, 579–80 (Pongratz-Leisten); Burstein 1978, esp. pp. 4–10; Kuhrt 1987; Sterling 1992: 103–16; *OCD*, 239–40 ('A.T.L.K.'): and van der Spek 2008. For his use of Babylonian sources, particularly the Babylonian chronicle, see Drews 1975: 54–55 and the biographical essay of De Breucker in *BNJ*, 680, and especially van der Spek 2008: 287–314. See also Lambert 1976.

<sup>21</sup> *FgrHist*, 273, with *FgrHistK*, 248–313. For Polyhistor, see *RE*, 1. I. 2, 1449–52 (Schwartz); *DNP*, I, 478–79 (Montanari); *OCD*, 60 (Pelling); Troiani 1988: 9–39; and Droge 1989: 12–13.

quote Manetho on Egypt more than they do Hecataeus, who was the mainstay of Hellenistic writers more generally.

Other, less well-known, authors would also seem to belong to this early flowering of historical apologetics. Menander of Ephesus (or perhaps Pergamon) and Dios wrote, respectively, a chronicle and a history of Phoenicia in Greek, about which almost nothing is known apart from their existence.<sup>22</sup> Jacoby places both authors in the second century BC. Their best-known follower was Herennius Philo of Byblos, who wrote his *Phoenician History* in the early second century AD, relying on earlier Phoenician traditions that had passed through a Hellenistic intermediary.<sup>23</sup>

### *Jewish Apologetics in the Greek World*

Of greater importance to the present volume is the Jewish response to Greek claims of antiquity and superiority. Jewish apologetics took many forms, but the most relevant to the development of later chronographic genres are Jewish chronological arguments that demonstrated the antiquity of Judaism and Jewish history with respect to the Greeks, Egyptians, and eventually Romans. As with other peoples in the Hellenistic East, chronography was not, for the Jews, merely a matter of working out obscure chronologies, but rather a question of philosophy and of culture: which culture was older and had influenced the other? Individual Greeks like Homer and Plato could be shown to have followed and been influenced by the law, theology, and philosophies of Moses, who must therefore have predated them; better still, Abraham and Moses could emerge as the great cultural benefactors of the entire Mediterranean. With chronography, Jewish apologists could demonstrate that the cultural superiority claimed by the Greeks was founded upon and derived from Jewish patriarchal learning.<sup>24</sup> Historical apologetics on the

<sup>22</sup> *FgrHist*, 783 and *FgrHist*, 785 with *BNJ*, 783 (Naiden), 'Menander of Ephesos' (an entry on Menander of Pergamon is being prepared for *BNJ*; see also the end of the commentary to *BNJ*, 784 F 1a (López-Ruiz)). See *RE*, I. xv. 1, 762 (Laqueur); *DNP*, vii, 1219–20 (Meister); *OCD*, 483 (Rajak), 957 (Rajak); and Van Seters 1983: 195–99, 296–99.

<sup>23</sup> *FgrHist*, 790 and esp. *BNJ*, 790 (Kaldellis/López Ruiz). For Philo, see *RE*, I. viii. 1, 650–61 (Gudeman); *DNP*, v, 410–11 (Fornaro); *OCD*, 1168 (Goodman); Attridge and Oden 1981; Baumgarten 1981; Van Seters 1983: 205–08; and Droge 1989: 47–48. Oden 1978: 118–26 places Philo within the context of 'patriotic cultural history' and lists six characteristics of Hellenistic histories that Philo mirrors. Baumgarten 1981: 261–68 also details the fundamentally Hellenistic nature of Philo's source (the mysterious Sanchuniathon), as do Attridge and Oden 1981: 3–9.

<sup>24</sup> For an outline of the development of chronological arguments in Jewish historiography, see Grabbe 1979: 45–50, 65–67, and *passim*, and Sterling 1992: 137–225; for the defence against anti-

Hellenistic model seem to have come naturally to Jews, no doubt because the narrative of the Pentateuch was based on genealogy and chronology.

Demetrius, an Alexandrian historian and exegete who wrote under Ptolemy IV Philopator (r. 221–205 BC), is the earliest Jewish historian attested outside of the Old Testament.<sup>25</sup> His chronography covered at least the period of the patriarchs down to the fall of Judah. In this work Demetrius was particularly interested in the chronology and genealogies of the Old Testament and in establishing relative and absolute chronologies for the events down to his own day.<sup>26</sup> His attempt at bringing chronological structure and order to the Old Testament narrative included ‘correcting’ its text. This would seem to be a manifestation of the contemporary Jewish interest in chronological reconciliation within the Pentateuch that we can see particularly in the Septuagint, whose translators attempted to sort out the many chronological inconsistencies in the Hebrew text. It may be that this interest in chronology was, in both cases, prompted by the development of the Greek universal chronicle tradition, but that connection cannot be proved.<sup>27</sup>

The list of Jewish historical apologists also includes Aristobulus, an Alexandrian Jewish philosopher, writing c. 176–170 BC, who claimed that Aristotle, Plato, Pythagoras, Socrates, Orpheus, Aratus, Hesiod, Homer, and Linus derived knowledge and inspiration from Moses and the Pentateuch.<sup>28</sup> Eupolemus was a historian

Jewish and later anti-Christian polemic, see Feldman 1990; and for an important and detailed analysis of the development of biblical chronography and its use and abuse by Jewish and Greek Hellenistic chroniclers down to Castor of Rhodes and Ptolemy of Mendes (c. 40 BC), see Wacholder 1968.

<sup>25</sup> *FgrHist*, 722. For Demetrius, see Grabbe 1979: 46–47 and 48–49; Bickerman 1980a: 351–58; Holladay 1983: 51–91, esp. pp. 51–56; Doran 1987: 248–51; Finegan 1998: 140–43; and Gruen 1998: 80, 112–18, 128–29, 135–36 (who casts doubt on the standard date and location). For the fragments of the following writers, we cite Holladay (who includes commentaries on all the fragments).

<sup>26</sup> Frags 2, 3, and 6 (Holladay 1983: 62–74, 74–76, 78). See also Holladay 1983: 52.

<sup>27</sup> It is clear that the Septuagint translators of the Pentateuch attempted to sort out certain chronological problems with the Hebrew text. A good example of the widely divergent chronologies presented by the Hebrew (Masoretic) and Greek (Septuagint) texts between Adam and Abraham is provided by a comparative table in Finegan 1998: 195. On this, see Wacholder 1968: 452–58, who believes that the translators may have been influenced by Demetrius’s calculations. Most scholars, however, believe that the Greek translation of the Pentateuch predates Demetrius: Grabbe 1979: 46 n. 9.

<sup>28</sup> Aristobulus, *Tést.*, 2, 4; frags 2.4, 3.1–3 (=3a.1–3 = 3a1.6–8), 4.4 (=4a.3), 4.6 (=4b.2a), 5.13–16 (= Holladay 1995: 114–15, 136, 152–54, 158–60, 162–64, 170, 172, 188–94). In



who wrote in the fifth year of Demetrius I Soter of Syria (thus 158–157 BC).<sup>29</sup> He worked out a chronology from the creation of the world to his own day, placing Creation in approximately 5307 BC (frag. 5), and claimed that Moses had invented the alphabet and given it to the Jews, who gave it to the Phoenicians, who in turn gave it to the Greeks (frag. 1).<sup>30</sup> Ps-Eupolemus is often identified as a Syro-Palestinian or Samaritan historian of the mid- to late second century, but there are reasons for believing that this author, identified by Alexander Polyhistor (the ultimate source of the fragment) as Eupolemus, is in fact actually Eupolemus.<sup>31</sup> In the one surviving fragment, Abraham teaches both the Phoenicians and Egyptians astrology and many other useful arts, which he, Enoch, and the Babylonians had discovered.<sup>32</sup>

Artapanus was an Alexandrian Jewish historian usually said to have been writing during the second century BC, though some have dated him as early as the late third century.<sup>33</sup> Most recently a detailed argument has placed him very specifically in the period 118–116 BC.<sup>34</sup> He wrote for a distinctly Egyptian audience and made Abraham, Joseph, and Moses heroic figures and the benefactors of Egypt and mankind: Abraham taught the Egyptians astrology; Joseph established organized agriculture and invented measures. Moses taught Orpheus; invented ships, machines for lifting stones, weapons, machines for drawing water and for warfare, and philosophy; established the nomes of Egypt and their gods; gave the sacred writing (hieroglyphics) to the priests; and was identified with Hermes.<sup>35</sup>

general, see Holladay 1995: 43–96 and Gruen 1998: 246–51. For the date and location of Aristobulus, see Holladay 1995: 43–75.

<sup>29</sup> *FgrHist*, 723.

<sup>30</sup> Fragments 1, 2, 3, and 5 (Holladay 1983: 112, 115, 118–22, 132, 134). See Wacholder 1974: 1–70 and 243–58, Holladay 1983: 93–104, Doran 1987: 263–70, Droge 1989: 13–19, Finegan 1998: 143–45, and Gruen 1998: 138–46, 153–54. Wacholder 1974 presents a number of commentaries on the various fragments: frag. 1 (pp. 71–85), frag. 2 (pp. 129–201), frag. 3 (pp. 223–25), frag. 4 (pp. 227–42), and frag. 5 (pp. 98–128).

<sup>31</sup> *FgrHist*, 724. See Doran 1987: 270–74 and Gruen 1998: 146–50. For the standard view, see Wacholder 1963; Holladay 1983: 157–65; Finegan 1998: 146–47; and Droge 1989: 19–25.

<sup>32</sup> Frag. 1 (Holladay 1983: 170–74).

<sup>33</sup> *FgrHist*, 726.

<sup>34</sup> Zellentin 2008: 52–63.

<sup>35</sup> Fragments 1; 2.2–3; 3.4–6, 9, 28 (Holladay 1983: 204, 206, 208–10, 212, 220). See also Holladay 1983: 189–93; Doran 1987: 257–63; Droge 1989: 25–35; Finegan 1998: 145–46; Gruen 1998: 87–89, 150–51, 155–60 (who argues for ignorance on Artapanus's date); and Zellentin 2008.

Finally, Cleodemus Malchus, perhaps a writer of the second century and perhaps a Samaritan living near Carthage, wrote a history in which he claimed that Heracles married a granddaughter of Abraham.<sup>36</sup>

### *Jewish Apologetics under Rome*

Little in Jewish apologetics changed with the coming of Rome, and the by-then centuries-old apologetic arguments can still be found resonating in Philo, an Alexandrian Jew whose lifetime straddled the turn of the millennium and who wrote many voluminous works, especially on the Pentateuch.<sup>37</sup> His discussions mostly concern the priority of Moses and the debt that Greek legislators and philosophers — Socrates, Hesiod, Aristotle, the Stoics, and particularly Heraclitus — owe to him.

More famous still is Flavius Josephus, the Jewish author of the second half of the first century, who claimed that Abraham had taught the Egyptians arithmetic and astronomy and that Pythagoras had imitated Jewish teachings, ideas that could already be found in Eupolemus, Artapanus, and Aristobulus.<sup>38</sup> More important for such arguments was Josephus's own long apologetic, *Against Apion*.<sup>39</sup> In spite of the fact that he lived in a Roman world, Josephus's defence of the antiquity of the Jews is couched in exactly the same Hellenistic terms that his predecessors had used. Indeed, among his proof texts were the same Greek apologetics that we saw above: Manetho, Berossus, Dios, and Menander. This is almost certainly a result of his direct use of Hellenistic Greek chronographic sources.<sup>40</sup> As in earlier times, the two

<sup>36</sup> *FgrHist*, 727. Frag. 1 (Holladay 1983: 252 and 254). See Doran 1987: 255–57, Holladay 1983: 245–47, and Gruen 1998: 151–53. For other Jewish chronological works, see Finegan 1998: 147–52.

<sup>37</sup> Philo, *Quaestiones et solutiones in Genesin*, 2, 6, 3, 5, 4, 152, 167; *Quis rerum diuinarum heres sit*, 213–14; *De uita Mosis*, 2, 1–44 (on the general admiration of the Greeks for Moses and his works); *De specialibus legibus*, 4, 61; *De aeternitate mundi*, 17–19; and *Legum allegoria*, 1, 108, on all of which see Wolfson 1968: 141–43. For Philo, see Goodenough 1940; Schenck 2005; *RE*, 1, XXI, 1, 1–50 (Leisegang); *DNP*, XI, 55–61 (Runia); *OCD*, 1167–68 (Rajak). Texts and translations can be found in Colson and Marcus 1929–53.

<sup>38</sup> Josephus, *Antiquities*, 1, 167–68 (text and trans.: Thackeray 1930); *Against Apion*, 1, 162–65 (text and trans.: Thackeray 1926).

<sup>39</sup> See Droge 1989: 35–47; Goodman 1999.

<sup>40</sup> Josephus, *Against Apion*, 1, 73–165, 2, 154–56. See Milikowsky 2002: 159–81, 191–97 and Sterling 1992: 226–310.

Roman-era authors Philo and Josephus laid great stress on Jewish chronology and antiquity, and they were not alone in doing so.

Justus of Tiberias, best known for Josephus's polemical attack upon him in his *Life*, wrote what Photius calls a chronicle (χρονικόν) entitled *Ιουδαίων βασιλεῖς οἱ ἐν τοῖς στέμμασιν* (*Jewish Kings in the Form of Genealogical Tables*), at some point during the second half of the first century AD.<sup>41</sup> It extended from Moses to Julius Agrippa II (d. before AD 93) and at some point referred to events involving Plato at the trial of Socrates. It has recently been convincingly argued that this work 'focused upon chronological matters and had chronological-genealogical tables' and also included a synchronism between Moses and Inachus. If this is correct, then the work was probably a synchronistic analysis of Jewish and Greek history (at least) not unlike what we soon see from Christian apologists and later authors like Africanus, Eusebius, and Syncellus.<sup>42</sup> Indeed, this work, or works like it (of the sort we see in the Leipzig Chronograph), could have been the inspiration for later Christian chronographers like Africanus.

Although it was not an apologetic work in the same mould as the others discussed above, nor written in Greek, we may also in this context take note of the *Seder Olam* (*The Ordering of the World*), which is, in the opinion of many, the definitive Jewish chronological work.<sup>43</sup> Its original edition, which seems to have been used by Josephus, covered the period of the Old Testament.<sup>44</sup> The work was later extended with approximately twenty lines concerning the Second Temple period down to the revolt of Bar Kokhba (AD 132–35) and was used extensively as a didactic work by the mid-second-century rabbi Yose ben Halafta, one of the Tannaim, or Rabbinic scholars whose views are recorded in the Mishna. The *Seder Olam* is the earliest Jewish chronographic work to survive intact and depends upon earlier Jewish chronographic research in Greek and Hebrew going back to Demetrius. The *Seder Olam*'s calculations are the origin of the modern Jewish year dates (AD 2012–13 = 5773). It also seems probable that the *Seder Olam* either directly

<sup>41</sup> Photius, *Bibliotheca*, cod. 33; *EgrHist*, 734 F 1–3; and Holladay 1983: 371–83.

<sup>42</sup> Milikowsky 2007: 107–08.

<sup>43</sup> Milikowsky 2002: 183–85, 198–200 and Milikowsky 2006. See also Berenbaum and Skolnik 2007: XVIII, 235–36 (Rosenthal), and First 1997: 3–7, 153–60. See in particular Milikowsky (forthcoming). Many Orthodox Jewish writers and rabbis still maintain the accuracy of the *Seder Olam*'s chronology for the Persian period against modern historical and chronological reconstructions (see First 1997: 34–44; Milikowsky 2002: 199 n. 73).

<sup>44</sup> Milikowsky 2002: 181–83, 185–90.

or indirectly influenced Eusebius in his interpretation of the Hebrew Old Testament.<sup>45</sup>

These Jewish apologetic views received wide circulation in the Hellenistic and Roman worlds. Numenius of Apamea, a Neoplatonist and Pythagorean philosopher of the second century AD, shows how far the apologetic argument had succeeded in his famous saying, 'For what is Plato other than Moses speaking Attic?'<sup>46</sup> Attempts to establish exact chronologies for the Old Testament have continued down the centuries: we may cite Eusebius in the fourth century AD; Bede in the early eighth, who was accused of heresy for using the Latin Vulgate (Hebrew) chronology instead of Eusebius-Jerome's Septuagint (Greek) chronology; Bishop James Ussher in 1650, who famously placed the creation of the world on 23 October 4004 BC, a date still revered by American Christian fundamentalists; and the exercise continues even to this day.<sup>47</sup> But the whole endeavour began with the Septuagint translators and Demetrius in the third century BC, and the much better-known Christian apologetics were their direct continuation.

### *The Earliest Christian Apologetics*

The Romans considered Christianity to be a new religion (an oxymoronic phrase as far as they were concerned) and therefore worthy of neither respect nor consideration. When the Christians began to suffer bitter and increasingly violent persecution at the hands of the Roman state because of their refusal to participate in the state cult, they responded with apologetics that employed exactly the same arguments that Jewish apologists had used to defend the antiquity of Judaism.<sup>48</sup> Because the Christians had co-opted the Jewish history of the Old Testament, to defend its antiquity was to defend the antiquity of Christianity; that is, because the promises and prophecies of the Old Testament were fulfilled in the New Testament, Christianity could be taken to share Judaism's antiquity. Many Christians, like Justin Martyr and Eusebius, even believed that the patriarchs, in particular Abraham,

<sup>45</sup> Chaim Milikowsky, personal communications.

<sup>46</sup> Frag. 8: 'τί γάρ ἐστι Πλάτων ἢ Μωυσῆς ἀττικίζων'. For Numenius, see Gager 1972: 63–69. Edwards 1990 demonstrates that Numenius was not the Jewish expert or sympathizer that he is often made out to be and suggests that his famous comment may not even be original to him.

<sup>47</sup> See the tables in Finegan 1998: 194–269.

<sup>48</sup> For the arguments about the dating of Moses in particular, see Pépin 1955; Goulet 1977; Burgess 1997: 488–89, 503–04.

were, in fact, Christian.<sup>49</sup> Chronological arguments involving the antiquity of Greek culture in relation to Jewish culture therefore took centre stage, and the arguments that the Jews and Egyptians in particular had used against the Greeks were now used by the Christians against the Romans, who, as we noted above, had accepted the Greek view of earlier Mediterranean history and understood their own culture as an extension of Greek culture.<sup>50</sup> As the second-century Christian apologist Theophilus said, 'Now I wish [...] to demonstrate the chronology for you more exactly, so that you may recognize that our doctrine is neither modern nor mythical but more ancient and true than all the poets and historians'.<sup>51</sup>

The most important early Christian chronological defences were made within the context of much larger and more diverse works of apologetic: Justin Martyr's *Apologia* (*First Apology*), 150s; Tatian's *Oratio ad Graecos* (*Oration to the Greeks*), c. 177; Theophilus's *Ad Autolycum* (*To Autolycus*), c. 185; Tertullian's *Apologeticum* (*Apology*), c. 197; Clement of Alexandria's *Stromata* (*Miscellanies*) in c. 200; and the anonymous *Cohortatio ad Graecos* (*Exhortation to the Greeks*), a work of the period 260 to 302 mistakenly attributed to Justin Martyr.<sup>52</sup> We see in these

<sup>49</sup> One explanation for this belief can be found in Syncellus, *Ecl. chron.*, p. 111.18–26, and see further below.

<sup>50</sup> For the important connection between Christian apologetic and the Hellenistic 'war of books' described above, see Droge 1989: 8–11, 195–200.

<sup>51</sup> Theophilus, *Ad Autolycum*, 3. 16, translation from Grant 1970: 121. Theophilus concludes with the same claim, 'From the compilation of the periods of time and from all that has been said, the antiquity of the prophetic writings and the divine nature of our message are obvious. This message is not recent in origin, nor are our writings, as some suppose, mythical and false. They are actually more ancient and more trustworthy' (*Ad Aut.*, 3. 29; Grant 1970: 145).

<sup>52</sup> Justin, *Apologia*, 1. 44, 59–60, with Pouderon 2005: 131–71, esp. 134–38, and Casamassa 1944: 22–24, 67, 118–19 (text, trans., and commentary: Minns and Parvis 2009); Tatian, *Oratio ad Graecos*, 1, 31, 36–41, with Pouderon 2005: 175–201, esp. 178–81, and Casamassa 1944: 142–44 (text, trans., and commentary: Whittaker 1999); Theophilus, *Ad Aut.*, 3. 1, 16–30, with Pouderon 2005: 241–67, esp. 244–50, and Casamassa 1944: 197–99 (text, trans., and commentary: Grant 1970); Tertullian, *Apologeticum*, 19 (text: Hoppe 1939–42; trans.: Arbesmann, Daly, and Quain 1950); Clement, *Stromata*, 1. 101–47 (chronology) and 1. 60, 66–80, 160–70, 180–82; 2. 20, 78; 5. 89–141; 6. 4–39 (Greek debt to Moses), with Ridings 1995: 29–139, esp. pp. 112–17, listing Clement's many and varied claims for Greek literature and philosophy's dependence on Jewish and Christian antiquity (text: Stählin and Früchtel 1960; trans.: Ferguson 1991); Ps-Justin, *Cohortatio ad Graecos*, 9, 12, 14–37, with Pouderon 2005: 297–302 and Casamassa 1944: 95–96 (text: Marcovich 1990; text and trans.: Pouderon and others 2009). See also Droge 1989: 49–193 and Young 1999: 82–99, and for Christian apologetics in general, Grant 1988. For a detailed discussion of two other more shadowy apologetic chronographers, Cassian and Judas, see 'Chapter 3, note 52' in the Appendices to the Footnotes, pp. 365–66 below.

works the same arguments that Jewish apologists had been using for centuries, particularly in regard to the debt of Greek lawgivers, philosophers, and poets to Moses and the Hebrew prophets, who lived not only before any known Greek writer but even before the invention of the Greek alphabet. Plato, Homer, Socrates, Aristotle, Orpheus, Solon, and Pythagoras, for instance, all reappear in the Christian apologists, and the proof texts come from the same Greek historians as had been cited by earlier apologists: Diodorus (who had used Hecataeus as a source), Berossus, Manetho, Menander, Ptolemy of Mendes, Josephus, Alexander Polyhistor, and Plato, especially in his *Timaeus*.

There was, however, an important difference between the Christian apologetic argument and that of its Jewish and Hellenistic predecessors. Christian apologetic was strongly influenced by the still flourishing tradition of the Greek Olympiad chronicle that we discussed in Chapter 2. We know that Demetrius and Eupolemus had been interested in establishing exact chronologies for Jewish history, but there is no evidence that other Jewish apologists before Justus took the same trouble over establishing chronology and detecting chronological synchronisms that we generally see in Justus and the Christian tradition after Justin. The obvious popularity of secular Olympiad chronicles and works like the Leipzig Chronograph in the ecumenical world of the Roman Empire meant that Christian writers easily adopted these chronological frameworks and concepts for their own works. They assumed, moreover, that their readers were familiar with such chronicles and the history related in them, as Theophilus shows when citing the second-century Olympiad history of Thallus.<sup>53</sup> Tatian and Clement can cite the chronologies of Eratosthenes and Apollodorus, and Tatian's chapter forty-one clearly derives from an Olympiad chronicle, although he does not tell us which one.<sup>54</sup>

For these Christian apologists, it was no longer enough simply to claim that Plato copied Moses or to argue on the grounds of shared ideas or supposed literary dependence. Instead, Moses's antiquity could be demonstrated on the page by comparing the actual chronologies of, and synchronisms between, Hebrew and Greek history in particular, while also comparing them to Egyptian, Argive, Persian, Tyrian, Babylonian, and Macedonian history. For these ends, and in spite of the specific utility of chronicles, any history that provided regnal lists and chronologies could be used and quoted as a source, hence the frequent references in

<sup>53</sup> Theophilus, *Ad Aut.*, 3. 29. For Thallus, see Appendix 7.3.

<sup>54</sup> Tatian, *Oratio ad Graecos*, 41; Clement, *Stromata*, 1. 105, 117, 138, 139. The author of the anonymous *Cohortatio ad Graecos* also mentions Thallus and Castor of Rhodes (9. 2), but this has been copied from Africanus (*Chron.*, F 34.31–34, p. 74).

Christian apologetics to such authors as Manetho, Berossus, Ptolemy, Menander, Polyhistor, and Josephus. This undifferentiated use of various apologetic histories with quite different aims could produce strange results. It certainly caused the anonymous author of the *Cohortatio ad Graecos* serious problems when, in a strange fit of apologetic confusion, he combined the arguments for Egyptian priority from Hecataeus (via Diodorus) and for patriarchal priority from the Jewish apologists. Having done this, he went on through careful textual and philosophical analyses of their writings to demonstrate the debts that Orpheus, the Sibyl, Homer, Sophocles, Pythagoras, and especially Plato owed to Moses and the prophets as a result of their visits to Egypt.<sup>55</sup>

More generally, because they drew simultaneously on earlier apologetic traditions and the various secular historical traditions, Christian apologists devoted large sections of their arguments to supporting quotations from or references to Greek historians; to genealogies; to chronological demonstrations, analyses, and synchronisms; and to regnal lists. By the late second century this had become so *de rigueur* in an apologetic work that touched on this subject that Tertullian felt compelled to explain why he could not provide this expected display of erudition: it would, he complains, be far too difficult and time-consuming for him to sift through all the many different Greek, Egyptian, Phoenician, and Babylonian histories, indeed the histories of all nations, as well as the Greek census lists; to sort out the chronologies; and to do all the mathematical calculations on his fingers ('cum digitorum supputariis gesticulis'). Instead he settles for providing just four bald synchronisms. Moses was

of the same age as the Argive Inachus; by nearly 400 years — actually, it was seven years less — he antedated Danaus, whom you consider the most ancient of your race; he lived about 1,000 years before the death of Priam; I might even say that he was about 500 years earlier than Homer, too, and I have reliable authorities to follow. As for the rest of the Prophets, too, although they lived after Moses, are not their very latest representatives older than the earliest of your philosophers, lawgivers, and historians?<sup>56</sup>

These four examples are obviously copied from an earlier apologist, and they are all Tertullian provides, promising more later but declining to digress any further from his immediate purpose at this point.<sup>57</sup>

<sup>55</sup> Cf. the connection between the patriarchs and Egypt in Artapanus, above.

<sup>56</sup> Tertullian, *Apol.*, 19.3, translation corrected from Arbesmann, Daly, and Quain 1950: 58–59.

<sup>57</sup> The so-called *Fragmentum Fuldense* (an alternative version of the first part of this chapter of the *Apologeticum* from the unusual codex Fuldensis) provides just two synchronisms, one with

We may note that chronology was useful for apologists even when it was not a matter of the very ancient past. Just like the authors of Olympiad chronicles, the apologists Theophilus and Clement extended their chronologies not just to the end of the Old Testament or to the time of the resurrection but right down to the time at which they wrote, including the reigns of the Roman emperors. It is important to notice how thoroughly Christian apologists partook of long-standing, and still vital, trends in historical and chronographic writing under the Roman Empire.

### *The Consummatio Mundi and Julius Africanus*

This centuries-old apologetic use of chronology encouraged, and was further encouraged by, another quite separate chronological project, likewise borrowed from Jewish scholarly traditions: the calculation of the date of the *consummatio mundi*, or end of the world, and thus of the *Parousia*, or Second Coming of Christ. Jesus had prophesied that the *consummatio* would occur within his generation, and most of the books of the New Testament, especially the letters of Paul, were written in the expectation of the imminent return of Christ.<sup>58</sup> When it became obvious that these early beliefs were mistaken — the world, after all, had failed to end — it became necessary to create a new formula that would provide for a more distant *consummatio*.<sup>59</sup> The first such attempt is visible as early as the year 120, the probable date of the *Epistle of Barnabas*.<sup>60</sup> By then, Christians awaiting the *Parousia* (Second Coming) extrapolated from the six days of Creation and II Peter 3. 8 — ‘with the Lord a day can mean a thousand years, and a thousand years is like a day’, itself based on Psalm 89 (90). 4, ‘To you a thousand years are a single day’ — and concluded that the world would last six thousand years. For those who accepted this scheme, it became necessary to calculate the extent of past time in order to be

Danaus and the other with the Trojan War, though the first (300 years) is different from that given in the quoted passage (393 years). On the problem of the manuscript tradition of the *Apologeticum*, see Barnes 1971: 13–14, 239–41. The source of part, at least, of this alternative version would appear to be Theophilus: cf. *Apol.*, 19. 1. 1–2 with Theophilus, *Ad Aut.*, 3. 21 and 29.

<sup>58</sup> E.g. Mt. 16. 28, 24. 34; I Thess. 4. 13–5. 11; II Thess. 2; I Cor. 7. 26, 29; Rev. 1. 1.

<sup>59</sup> By the time of II Peter it was becoming obvious that the promise was not being fulfilled (3. 1–10). These views arose out of a long tradition of Jewish apocalypticism which we do not discuss here because of its obvious differences from Christian apocalypticism. For the background, see J. Collins 1998: 256–79, which includes a chapter on the earliest forms of Christian apocalypticism.

<sup>60</sup> *Barnabae Epistula*, 15. 4. On the period of the earliest eschatological beliefs from the time of Barnabas, see Landes 1988: 141–45.



able to date the future *Parousia*. By the beginning of the third century AD, the Incarnation had come to be placed precisely in the year 5500 of the world, mid-way through the 'sixth day' of Creation, thus leaving five hundred years between the birth of Christ and the *Parousia*.<sup>61</sup> Although this refinement of the six-thousand-year scheme is often credited to Julius Africanus, it actually first appeared around the year 204 in Hippolytus's *Commentary on Daniel*.<sup>62</sup> It was then taken up and popularized by Africanus.<sup>63</sup> Thereafter, and thanks to his influence, it was adopted by many other Greek and Latin writers, with and without modification.<sup>64</sup> These calculations were taken seriously, as one would expect given that the end of the world was at stake. The *Consularia Vindobonensia posteriora* explicitly marks the year 495 as the five hundredth year from the birth of Christ and the six thousandth year since Adam. The related *Paschale Campanum* records under the year 493, 'His consulibus ignari praesumptores ferunt Antechristum nasciturum' ('Stupid and over-confident people claim that the Antichrist will be born this year') and, under

<sup>61</sup> This calculation mainly derived from the fact that Christ was crucified at noon, half way through Friday, the sixth day of the week (John 19. 14), though Hippolytus also mentions that the total number of cubits of the Ark of the Covenant ( $2.5 + 1.5 + 1.5$ ) equals five and a half (Exodus 25. 10; Hippolytus, *In Daniele*, 4. 24; ed. by Lefèvre 1947). It is likely that Ps-Eustathius's explication of the former parallel in his *Commentarius in Hexaëmeron* actually derives from Julius Africanus, as does the earlier part of the paragraph (PG, 18: 757D); see Africanus, *Chron.*, F 94 (p. 290). But the fact that contemporary chronological calculations were already putting the Incarnation around 5500 anyway (see next note) was probably the major spur to this scheme.

<sup>62</sup> *In Daniele*, 4. 23–24, on which, see Landes 1988: 145–49. The final total of years since Adam in Theophilus, *Ad Aut.*, 3. 28 (5695 = AD 180) would put Christ's birth in *c.* AM 5513 (AM = 'annus mundi' = 'year of the world'), while that in Clement, *Stromata*, 1. 144. 3 (5784 = AD 192) would place it in *c.* AM 5590 (though Clement's figures are inconsistent and in many places corrupt). Neither makes anything of these calculations or hints that he is aware of the importance of the year 5500, however. These figures were certainly based on earlier Jewish calculations, since we can see that similar figures had been in circulation as early as the second century BC: Eupolemus's figure for the creation of the world (see above, the section on 'Jewish Apologetics in the Greek World') implies a date of *c.* AM 5307 for the birth of Christ. For the debate over the identity of Hippolytus, see the first paragraph of 'Chapter 3, n. 73' in the Appendices to the Footnotes, pp. 366–67 below.

<sup>63</sup> Africanus, *Chron.*, F 15 and T 93c (pp. 24 and 288).

<sup>64</sup> For a list and discussion, see Landes 1988: 150–51, 152, 154, 161–64, 165 n. 113. Landes is more interested in the western response to this view, rather than the Byzantine. Two other important eastern followers were Annianus (Syncellus, *Ecl. chron.*, p. 35.21–23) and Syncellus (*Ecl. chron.*, p. 382.18–19). As Mango 1980: 192 puts it, 'all the early Christian and Byzantine systems, except that of Eusebius, attempt to come as closely as possible to this figure'.

496, 'Alii delerantes hoc consule dicunt Antecristum nasciturum' ('Other madmen say that the Antichrist will be born in this year').<sup>65</sup> Five hundred years from the birth of Christ is 498, give or take a year or two.<sup>66</sup> Thanks to the popularity of Africanus's calculations, the reign of Anastasius (491–518) thus became 'a time of intense eschatological speculation'.<sup>67</sup> Detailed chronological analysis was the only method by which such momentous issues could be addressed.

By the third century, however, instead of simply being a part of a greater argument, chronography had come into its own as an apologetic weapon. The earliest known stand-alone instance of apologetic chronography is the *Chronographiae* of Julius Africanus, which we have mentioned above.<sup>68</sup> Written in 221, this was a work in five books that provided synchronized chronologies of ancient empires in narrative form, among them the empires of the Hebrews, Egyptians, Sicyonians, Greeks, Macedonians, Persians, and Romans.<sup>69</sup> It therefore looked very much like the later *Chronographia* of Eusebius (the vol. I prolegomenon to his vol. II, the *Chronici canones*) and the *Ecloga chronographica* of Syncellus. That is to say, it was for the most part made up of extensive chronological commentaries and analyses, with tables of regnal years listed by kingdom. It thus owes its structure entirely to its apologetic background, as can be seen especially from the extended analyses found in Theophilus and Clement, whose *Stromata* Africanus knew and

<sup>65</sup> Mommsen 1892: 318, 330, 746–47. For these dates in the *Paschale Campanum*, see Troncarelli 1989. The variant dates arose because of corruption in the consular lists of these works, for which see the commentaries on these works in Volume II.

<sup>66</sup> The birth of Christ was usually put in 2 BC, the year when the consuls were Augustus for the thirteenth time and Silvanus: e.g. *Descriptio consulum*, s.a. 2 BC (p. 226); *Consularia Vindobonensia*, 72–74 and *Consularia Scaligeriana*, 79–80 (Mommsen 1892: 278); *Prologus Paschae* (Mommsen 1892: 737); *Additamenta ad Chronica maiora Isidori*, post 234 (Mommsen 1894: 499); Eusebius, *Chron. can.*, 169<sup>c</sup>; and Malalas, *Breviarium*, 10. 1 (p. 173.10). There were other views as well, but they did not differ by much: see Finegan 1998: 288–91; Mosshammer 2008: 319–38; and Burgess 2006a: 42 and Wallraff 2007: 351 fold-out (for Africanus).

<sup>67</sup> Mango 1980: 203. See also Vasiliev 1942–43: 469–70.

<sup>68</sup> See Wallraff 2006b and the edition and translation in Wallraff 2007, of which the latter supersedes everything that went before. See also Andrei 2005 for a different context for the works of Africanus and Hippolytus (below). As noted in Chapter 2, a recently published papyrus, dating to the first half of the second century, is said to contain the earliest surviving Christian chronicle, but there is absolutely nothing Christian about the papyrus. See Appendix 6 for a description and discussion of this work, which we call the Leipzig Chronograph, and Appendix 4.3 for a translation.

<sup>69</sup> For the date, see Burgess 2006a: 39–42 and Wallraff 2007: xvii–xviii.

mentioned.<sup>70</sup> Africanus was also very interested in eschatology and therefore has much to say about the prophecy of Daniel.<sup>71</sup> As we have seen, Africanus believed that the world would exist for six thousand years and that Christ had been born in the year 5500. This left just under 280 years between the time of Africanus's writing and the *Parousia*.

Africanus's *Chronographiae*, while very much concerned with chronology, is not a chronicle on any definition of that term, let alone the one adopted here. For that reason, we refer to it as an annotated chronograph (see the addendum to Chapter 1). Still less of a chronicle is another work often treated alongside Africanus. The original Greek version of the so-called *Liber generationis*, a sort of chronological 'handbook for the study of the Bible',<sup>72</sup> is attributed by modern scholarship to Hippolytus, an 'antipope' in Rome from 217 to 235. Who Hippolytus was is not germane to the present discussion, but whoever he was, he was not the author of the original Greek recension of the *Liber generationis*, in spite of a scholarly tradition stretching back to at least 1601. The textual history of the work attributed to him, however, is still of importance for our investigation.<sup>73</sup> Its familiar Latin title is *Liber generationis* (the first words in manuscripts B (Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, MS Phillipps 1829) and F (Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, MS lat. 10910), from Matthew 1. 1) but its title in Greek is *Συναγωγή χρόνων καὶ ἐτῶν ἀπὸ κτίσεως κόσμου ἕως τῆς ἐνεστώσης ἡμέρας* (*A Collection of Chronologies from the Creation of the World to the Present Day*). This text survives in a recension of the tenth or eleventh century, three different incomplete Latin translations, an incomplete Armenian translation, and various other later witnesses in Latin, Greek, and Armenian.<sup>74</sup> The original Greek text was written in 235, as is demonstrated by

<sup>70</sup> Theophilus, *Ad Aut.*, 3. 16–29; Clement, *Stromata*, 1. 101–47; and Africanus, *Chron.*, F 97 (p. 292). As noted above, Justus of Tiberias's *Jewish Kings* would seem to have been influential in promoting this method of analysing the past, and there were no doubt many other works like the Leipzig Chronograph in circulation as well.

<sup>71</sup> Africanus, *Chron.*, T 77–78, F 93 (pp. 232–38, 276–88).

<sup>72</sup> Rouse and McNelis 2000: 207.

<sup>73</sup> A short discussion of the modern controversy over the identity of Hippolytus and an analysis of the weaknesses of the arguments that link Hippolytus and the *Liber generationis* can be found in 'Chapter 3, note 73' in the Appendices to the Footnotes, pp. 366–71 below.

<sup>74</sup> Texts: Mommsen 1892: 89–140 (Latin), Bauer 1905 (Greek and Latin only to end of Greek parallels), and Bauer and Helm 1955 (Greek; Latin and Armenian only after end of Greek text). Unfortunately the stemma in Bauer and Helm (1955: xiv) is quite erroneous and in need of revision since the 'Pap. Gol. nach 412' (*Chronographia Golenischevensis*) and the 'Barbarus/Cod. Parisin. 7./8. Jhdt.' (the *Chronographia Scaligeriana*) descend from a common compilation that

the emperor list of the most complete and accurate Latin translation (*Lib. gen. I*): this concludes with the death of Severus Alexander, assassinated in mid-March 235, and contains three other references to the ‘thirteenth year of Alexander’, his last year (§§ 302–03, 314, 331). Other Latin translations have been extended by later compilers. Of these, one version (manuscript V (Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, MS 3416); *Lib. gen. II*) has a *supputatio* that ends with the consuls of 334, indicating that the translation was made or revised in that year (consular dates for the years 194, 249, and 304 also appear in this *supputatio*; Mommsen 1892: 140). Two other manuscripts, witnesses to the common version of *Lib. gen. I*, have *supputationes* that give the consuls and an *ab urbe condita* date for the year 359, and the consuls and an *annus mundi* date for 365.<sup>75</sup> The third translation appears within the text of the *Chronographia Scaligeriana* (often referred to as the *Excerpta Latina barbari* or *Barbarus Scaligeri*) and represents a late eighth-century Latin translation of an original Greek compendium dating to the reign of Justinian.<sup>76</sup>

Despite its tangled textual history and multiple recensions, the Συναγωγὴ χρόνων/*Liber generationis* is nothing more than a collection of lists, what we call a chronograph (see the addendum to Chapter 1), and is not fundamentally different from an earlier pagan text like the Leipzig Chronograph.<sup>77</sup> The first and longest of these lists treats the patriarchs, judges, and kings of the Old Testament from Adam down to the end of the Babylonian Captivity in the first year of Cyrus, devoting the most space to the *Division of the World* (Διαμερισμὸς τῆς γῆς in the

shared a common source with ‘Chron. Pasch. 613’ (the *Chronicon Paschale*) and ‘Eutychios 937’ (the *Annales* of Eutychius), yet Bauer and Helm have them in three quite independent lines of descent. For this relationship, see Burgess forthcoming.

<sup>75</sup> The consuls ‘Valentinian and Valens’ could indicate any year out of 365, 368, 370, or 373, though the lack of iterations suggests the first of them. Manuscripts *C* (Rome, Biblioteca nazionale centrale Vittorio Emanuele II, MS Vitt. Em. 1325) and *G* (St Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek, MS 133) agree on the date of AM V̇DCCCCXXVIII (= 5928) that goes with the reference to this consulship in the preface (Mommsen 1892: 89; Rouse and McNelis 2000: 208–09). In an interpolation to chapter 296 (Mommsen 1892: 81), which provides the consuls for 359, the two manuscripts split, *C* offering V̇ICLXXXIII (= 6183), *G* offering V̇DCCCCLXII (= 5962). If we assume that *G* should read V̇DCCCCXXII (= 5922), then these *annus mundi* dates confirm a date of 365 for the consuls mentioned in the preface.

<sup>76</sup> See Burgess forthcoming, our Volume II, and Mommsen 1892: 89–140. For *Lib. gen. I*, which is found complete in four manuscripts and excerpted in three others, see Rouse and McNelis 2000, esp. pp. 207–11, 215.

<sup>77</sup> See Chapter 2, note 86.

Greek original) among the descendents of the sons of Noah, which includes a list of the different peoples — noting those with their own languages and those who could write — countries, islands, mountains, and rivers of the world. Then follows a quick *supputatio* from Adam with reference to those who kept Passover ('pascha') down to the time of Christ and the thirteenth year of Alexander. Next there follow in quick succession a list of Persian kings from Cyrus to Darius, a *supputatio* concerning Olympiads, the patriarchs from Adam to Christ, the names of Hebrew prophets and prophetesses, Hebrew kings and kings of Samaria, the names of the Hebrew priests, the Macedonian kings of Alexandria, and finally a list of Roman emperors. For all its piling on of detail, the *Συναγωγή χρόνων*/*Liber generationis* nevertheless contains no commentary or analysis along the lines of Africanus's *Chronographiae*. Although as a collection of lists it proved to be very popular in many different translations, it had no influence on the chronicle tradition at all and is never cited by any surviving chronicler, not even Eusebius, Jerome, or Syncellus, all of whom might have been expected to have known it.<sup>78</sup>

### *The Chronici canones of Eusebius*

We can now place Eusebius of Caesarea's *Chronici canones*, or rather Χρονικοὶ κανόνες καὶ ἐπιτομή παντοδαπῆς ιστορίας Ἑλλήνων τε καὶ βαρβάρων (*Chronological Tables and an Epitome of Universal History, both Greek and Foreign*) to give it its full title, within this long tradition of historical and chronological apologetic, which informed both its conception and execution.<sup>79</sup> Eusebius makes his debt to his predecessors quite clear, mentioning the chronological works of Josephus, Justus of Tiberias, Tatian, Clement, and Africanus, in both the preface and text of the *Canones*.<sup>80</sup> The works of most of the historians and apologists

<sup>78</sup> For Eusebius's supposed reference to Hippolytus's chronicle in *HE* 6. 22, see 'Chapter 3, note 73' in the Appendices to the Footnotes, p. 368 below.

<sup>79</sup> This title is from Eusebius's own *Eclogae propheticae* (PG, 22: 1024A). Elsewhere he simply refers to it as Χρονικοὶ κανόνες, as do later authors, like Oecumenius and George the Monk. Jerome records his own version of the title in his *De uiris illustribus* (81) as 'Chroniconum Canonum omnimoda historia et eorum ἐπιτομή' ('A universal history in the form of chronological tables and their epitome'), which was translated verbatim into Greek by Ps-Sophronius and copied by the *Suda* for its article on Eusebius as Χρονικῶν κανόνων παντοδαπῆς ιστορία καὶ τούτων ἐπιτομή.

<sup>80</sup> Josephus: 7. 16, 55a<sup>c</sup>, 113<sup>a</sup>, 174<sup>d</sup> (= p. 175. 11–23), 178<sup>c</sup>, 181<sup>d</sup>, 185<sup>f</sup>, 187<sup>a</sup>, and 191<sup>g</sup>; Justus: 7. 16 and 193<sup>c</sup>; Tatian, Clement, and Africanus in the preface: 7. 15; chronologies of Africanus and of Clement: 86b<sup>h,k</sup>, 113<sup>a</sup>, 214<sup>c</sup>, 100a<sup>a</sup>, 105b<sup>d</sup>.

discussed above were also known to him. Indeed, his *Preparation for the Gospel* is a major source for many of their surviving fragments. Furthermore, the entire chronological structure of the *Canones* is clearly based on the *supputationes* of apologists like Theophilus and Clement, which themselves go back to Jewish *supputationes*.

Eusebius was thus fully aware of his predecessors' work and followed in their footsteps both in method and in aims. Even had he wanted to, he could hardly have dissociated himself from that apologetic tradition, inasmuch as any reader would necessarily have read his work in light of it. After all, apologetic was the essential purpose of Christian chronography.<sup>81</sup> Like earlier apologists, Eusebius uses chronology to prove the greater antiquity of the Jewish patriarchs in comparison to the Greek gods and heroes, especially with respect to Abraham, the 'first Christian', and to Moses, who predated all pagan gods, heroes, and philosophers, though in his case he had a very specific target in mind for refutation: the variant chronology for the date of Moses advanced by Porphyry in his *Κατὰ Χριστιανῶν* (*Against the Christians*) of c. 300.<sup>82</sup> However, instead of simply continuing in the mould long since established by Hellenistic apologists and Africanus, Eusebius discovered a new way of setting forth his apologetic chronology of the Mediterranean kingdoms. He knew from his reading that Greek, Jew, Egyptian, Babylonian, and Phoenician all claimed supreme antiquity for their peoples, and that only one of them could be correct. Perhaps more important, his learning and his interests went beyond mere apologetic. He had a genuine and articulate interest in history and the desire to solve the problems it presented.<sup>83</sup> He needed a method or a format that

<sup>81</sup> See Ridings 1995: 141–96; Frend 1982: 591: 'In all Christian (and Jewish) historical writing there was an apologetic edge. Chronicles were aimed at demonstrating the antiquity of Christianity (or Judaism) compared with pagan religions, and this is what Eusebius intended in his historical writings'; and Burgess 1997: 491.

<sup>82</sup> See Jerome, *Chron. can.*, 24a<sup>d</sup>, cf. 34a<sup>a</sup>, and Eusebius, *HE*, 1. 4; D. S. Wallace-Hadrill 1960: 183; Adler 1989: 69–71; and Andrei 2008. By placing Abraham, Ninus, and Semiramis 'uno eodemque tempore in libelli fronte', as Eusebius says in the translation of Jerome (16. 13–14), he could immediately refute Porphyry's chronology. Porphyry's chronological attacks on Christianity in book four of *Against the Christians* show that chronography was such a fundamental part of Christian apologetic that any attack on Christianity necessitated an attack on Christian chronography as well. See Burgess 1997: 488–95, esp. pp. 488–89. In spite of continued reference to the work (see most recently Clarke 2008: 75–77), it is again worth pointing out that Porphyry never wrote a chronicle (see Croke 1983b) and that the chronological calculations attributed to him were derived entirely from his *Against the Christians*.

<sup>83</sup> Adler 1989: 70 n. 105: 'Eusebius' decision to begin with Abraham, and not some more remote event or person, shows, wrote Gelzer, that in the *Canones* Eusebius the historian had prevailed over Eusebius the apologist. It would have been dissembling if Eusebius had on the one hand

would allow him to lay out a complicated historical argument in a simple manner that could be easily grasped, while at the same time not evading the historiographical difficulties that had tested his predecessors.

He took his inspiration from the Hellenistic Olympiad chronicles. None of these survives intact for comparison, as we saw in Chapter 2, but even the two surviving fragments of the genre — the Oxyrhynchus papyrus and the excerpt from Phlegon of Tralles — reveal Eusebius's indebtedness to it.<sup>84</sup> Eusebius drew his style and his approach to content from Olympiad chronicles, adopting their standards of selection and brevity, as well as their universal approach to history. *POxy* I 12, for instance, covering the years 355/54 to 316/15 BC, includes the history of Greece, Rome, Syracuse, Persia, Philip, Alexander, and the *diadochoi*, as well as the Olympic games, literature, and philosophy (Plato, Speusippus, and Isocrates). The author was also interested in the rise and fall of empires, marking the end of the Persian Empire and noting its duration.<sup>85</sup> Phlegon recounts the expected narrative of military events of the Olympiad that covers the years 72–69 BC, but also includes a census report, an earthquake in Rome, Epicurean philosophers, the birth of Vergil, the succession of Parthian kings, and the dedication of the Capitolium. In selection and style, these examples are clearly echoed by Eusebius. What is more, similar content and stylistic approaches can also be found in the two examples of non-Olympiad chronicles preserved as inscriptions, the Parian Marble and the *Chronicon Romanum*, though the chronological framework for both of these is a countdown to the time of writing.<sup>86</sup>

polemical against the errors and flaws of non-biblical sources, and then overlooked the similar problems in Hebrew archaic history. Gelzer suggests as well that Eusebius' sensitivities to chronological problems had been sharpened by his learned opponent Porphyry, a scholar who was skilled in identifying inconsistencies in biblical chronology.<sup>7</sup> Gelzer's assessment was echoed by Sirinelli 1961: 52: 'Eusèbe ici est avant tout un historien, plus qu'un apologiste'.

<sup>84</sup> *POxy*, I 12 (*FgrHist*, 255) and the events of a single Olympiad of Phlegon of Tralles preserved in Photius (*FgrHist*, 257 F 12 = Photius, *Bibliotheca*, cod. 97). Both are translated in Appendix 4 below.

<sup>85</sup> The figure is unfortunately corrupt, but it is probably 233 years: *POxy*, I 12, col. V. 10–14. Africanus states that the Persian Empire lasted 230 years (*Chron.*, F 93.51, p. 280; see also Syncellus, *Ecl. chron.*, p. 314. 24), a figure also found earlier in Hippolytus (*In Danielelem*, 4. 24) and later in Eusebius's *Chron. can.* (as can be determined from the addition of the regnal years on pp. 102a to 124, though he actually covers 231 years, 560 BC to 330 BC, since he lists Darius's second year twice (105<sup>a</sup>)). Clement, *Stromata*, I. 140 reports 235 years. Modern calculations vary but are roughly similar to Eusebius's dates.

<sup>86</sup> For a summary of the contents, see Chapter 2 above. There are translations in Appendix 4 below.

Stylistically, then, we cannot help but see a link between the Hellenistic chronography of the third century BC and Eusebius's new Christian chronography of the early fourth century AD. But there is positive proof of the connection, as we saw in Chapter 2 in the common entry about the meteorite and its date, shared by Eusebius and the Parian Marble. Eusebius had not seen the Parian Marble, but his sources had sources, and these were related to the sources used by the author of the Parian Marble. No doubt most Olympiad chronicles were related to one another in similarly tralatitious ways. Other such exact parallels between Eusebius and the surviving Hellenistic chronicle tradition exist.<sup>87</sup> Whether they were preserved in codices, on papyrus rolls, or on marble, such chronicles are the origin of Eusebius's formulaic and repetitive structures and phraseology. The *Chronici canones*, which looks to us like a work of original scholarship, would have had the appearance of multiple pastiche to those familiar with earlier Olympiad chronicles and histories, in the same way that we can easily see that Eusebius's *Praeparatio Euangelica* (*Preparation for the Gospel*) is for the most part composed of verbatim quotations from other authors.

Eusebius took the content, structure, style, and historical approach of the Hellenistic chronicle (ἐπιτομή παντοδαπῆς ιστορίας), but separated out the histories of the various nations into different columns in order to combine them with the genealogical and regnal-year tables (κανόνες) of Christian apologetic chronography. As far as we know, no one before Eusebius had combined the genealogies and king lists of the earlier pagan and Christian traditions with the historical accounts that were to be found in the Hellenistic, pagan tradition of Olympiad chronicles. And no one had ever presented all these lists in synchronous columns, so that each individual or event in one kingdom could be compared chronologically on a single page with those of all the other contemporary kingdoms. Previously, regnal lists could only be presented one after the other, as illustrated by the Leipzig Chronograph. There seems little doubt that Eusebius adopted the idea of synchronic comparative columns from Origen's *Hexapla*, a work in which six different texts of the Old Testament in Hebrew and Greek were presented in comparative columns on double-page spreads, three to a page.<sup>88</sup> In essence what Eusebius had done was to Christianize the existing Olympiad chronicle tradition, restructuring it so that the year was no longer the major ideographic division on the page. Rather, the diachronic listing of kingdom and ruler (the column) was the

<sup>87</sup> For some examples, see Chapter 2, p. 85 and Burgess 1999: 83, 200–01, 208, and 214–15.

<sup>88</sup> Barnes 1981: 120 and Grafton and Williams 2006: xi–xii, 17–18, 86–177, esp. 142–43, 170.



basic unit of division, and synchronic geography (the row) was subordinate to it, a structure that allowed the reader to easily follow the history of each individual nation (the column), while also comparing the events of any single year across different kingdoms (the row). In this sense an Olympiad chronicle had but one axis, time, while the *Chronici canones* had two, kingdom and time, or, semiotically, kingdom through time.

We are not entirely certain when Eusebius began to work on the *Chronici canones*, but it was certainly not one of his early compositions. The first version probably appeared around 311 as a work of apologetic and scholarship, aimed at Christians and non-Christians alike.<sup>89</sup> The final and most influential edition was published in the latter half of 325 and was then modified slightly in the middle of 326.

The *Canones*, however, was actually the second book of a single work. Although we have no evidence for the title that Eusebius gave to this two-volume result of his chronological researches, it is usually referred to now as the *Chronicle*, a common word, as is demonstrated in Appendix 1, and a name applied to it by Syncellus, though we do not know whether it is a title or a description (*Ecl. chron.*, p. 41.23: 'ἐν τοῖς χρονικοῖς αὐτοῦ'; 'in his chronicle').<sup>90</sup> We shall simply refer to it as the chronicle, without a capital. The first book was the so-called Χρονογραφία (*Chronographia*), as we have noted above.<sup>91</sup> This prolegomenon volume to the *Canones* was a patchwork of narrative, chronological analysis, and variant regnal lists copied for the most part from earlier historians and chroniclers setting out, one nation at a time in the manner of earlier chronographers like Justus of Tiberias and Julius Africanus, the raw material for a complete chronology of world history from the time of the patriarch Abraham. In a very real and practical sense, the New Pauly supplement *Chronologies of the Ancient World: Names, Dates and Dynasties* and Jack Finegan's *Handbook of Biblical Chronology* are nothing more than expanded

<sup>89</sup> For these points, see Burgess 1997. For the chronicle and the historiographical background to it, see Mosshammer 1979: 29–112, an absolutely fundamental work; Gelzer 1880 and Gelzer 1885: 1–107; *RE*, 1. VI. 1, 1370–1439, esp. 1376–84 (Schwartz); *DNP*, IV, 309–10 (Rist); Quasten 1960: 311–14; Sirinelli 1961: 31–134; Adler 1992; Grant 1980: 3–9; Croke 1982; Croke 1983a; Croke 1990a; Barnes 1981: 111–25; D. S. Wallace-Hadrill 1960: 155–67; Adler 1989: 15–71; Finegan 1998: 160–92; Burgess 1999: 21–109; and Grafton and Williams 2006: 133–77.

<sup>90</sup> He also calls it a 'χρονικὴ συγγραφή' ('chronicle'; p. 197.6).

<sup>91</sup> The origin of the name is discussed in Appendix 1, note 1.

and modernized versions of Eusebius's *Chronographia* (or parts of it), so useful is such a work even now.<sup>92</sup>

The second volume of his chronicle, the *Canones* itself, is the synthesis and tabulation of the *Chronographia*'s raw material. It sets forth all known world history from the birth of Abraham, in what we would call 2016 BC, to AD 325, noting each regnal year of the kings of all the important Mediterranean kingdoms in parallel vertical columns first on double-page spreads, and then on single pages, to a maximum of nine kingdoms at a time. Important events and individuals from secular and biblical history are noted under their proper regnal years or Olympiads, to the extent that Eusebius could calculate them on the basis of the often conflicting evidence available to him. Eventually all the columns resolved themselves into a single column of text representing the year-by-year chronology of the Roman Empire: the polytheistic polyarchy of the past resolves itself into the monotheistic monarchy of the reign of Constantine.

Eusebius had begun his chronological researches trying to discover the date of Moses in order to refute Porphyry's *Against the Christians*. In the end, and almost unwittingly, he produced a teleological history of Christianity, starting with Abraham, whom he considered the first Christian, and culminating with a vision of a united Christian Mediterranean under Constantine. Although Eusebius was writing within definite chronographic traditions — Hellenistic and Christian — no such universal synchronism for world history that incorporated Greek, Mediterranean, and biblical history rather than just a series of individual regnal lists had ever been written before. Such a massive sweep of history, and particularly one that graphically represented every single year, which seems to have been another first for Eusebius, required a unifying chronological system. No such system existed in pagan chronology — a fact that was itself grist for Eusebius's apologetic mill — since Olympiads only started in 776 BC, the Trojan War ended in 1184–1183 BC, and the *Canones* began in 2016 BC. Works like the Parian Marble, which extended back earlier than the Trojan War, and those that did not employ Olympiads or archons, such as the *Chronicon Romanum*, had to rely on a reverse chronology, a 'before the present' system counting back from the time of writing. Christian and Jewish chronology also had a system of years since the creation of the world, but since no one agreed on when that was, it could not be a universal system in the way that Olympiads were. Besides, this system was tainted for Eusebius by its use in eschatological calculations, against which he was to some degree reacting. He therefore

<sup>92</sup> Eder and Renger 2007 and Finegan 1998.

tried as much as possible to avoid dealing with chronology before Abraham. But chiefly he wanted to avoid the divergent Hebrew, Samaritan, and Greek chronologies of the pre-Abrahamic Old Testament, which could not be reconciled.<sup>93</sup> He could hardly attack pagan historians for the inaccuracies in their chronologies and admit his failure at trying to reconcile the errors in his own.<sup>94</sup> Instead he invented a system of his own, a relative system that was valid only within the *Canones*: an accounting of years since the birth of Abraham. It counted forward from a key point in the past, rather than counting backwards from the present, which was always moving. Since Eusebius considered Abraham to have been the first Christian, his chronology was more than just an accounting of years; it was a chronology of the acceptance of Christ among men, a system with a clear apologetic value for a group striving to convince the pagan world of its antiquity.

As we have just mentioned, part of Eusebius's purpose in writing his two-volume chronological work was to oppose the eschatological view, popularized by Africanus, that the world would last six thousand years from Creation and that Christ had been born in the year 5500 (half-way through the metaphorical 'sixth day' of Creation). Unfortunately, his revisionist views on this and other chronological matters were not accepted by most other early Christian historians, and his new chronology came in for a great deal of criticism. A number of later authors reworked and modified it, notably Diodorus of Tarsus in the last quarter of the fourth century, Annianus and Panodorus at the beginning of the fifth century, Andronicus during the reign of Justinian (527–65), and Jacob of Edessa, a Syrian chronicler and writer, in c. 692. As a result of two centuries' worth of intense chronological criticism and revision, Eusebius's unaltered original text became harder and harder to find. Moreover, the complicated text of the original was difficult and expensive to copy.<sup>95</sup> It seems unlikely that an intact, uncontaminated version of the work survived the fourth century. Eventually it disappeared altogether, replaced, like so many complicated works, by simplifications and derivative works that were easier to use. Today, all that is left of Eusebius's *Canones* is Jerome's Latin translation, an Armenian translation surviving in one manuscript of the twelfth century that was ultimately based on a simplified Greek original of the fifth century, two Syriac epitomes that are parts of other chronicles, and excerpts from later

<sup>93</sup> See note 27 above.

<sup>94</sup> He still includes a few calculations from the creation of the world (using the Septuagint chronology), but he makes nothing of them.

<sup>95</sup> See Burgess 2006b. Origen's *Hexapla* succumbed to the same fate for the same reasons: Grafton and Williams 2006: 87–88, 105–07, 131–32.

Greek works that used Eusebius as a source.<sup>96</sup> The *Chronographia* has fared a little better than its sister work, inasmuch as large, continuous excerpts still exist in Greek, and a complete, and generally accurate, Armenian translation is also extant.<sup>97</sup> Though few people apart from specialists have even heard of it, Eusebius's original two-book *Chronographia-Chronici canones* is one of the great losses in the historical literature of Graeco-Roman antiquity.<sup>98</sup>

### *Jerome and the Development of Christian Latin Chronicles*

As we noted in the previous chapter, Jerome probably first came across a copy of the *Canones* in Antioch. He set about translating it into Latin in 380, when he arrived in Constantinople, adding extra material on Roman history and literature, and continuing it from its terminus in 325 down to 378.<sup>99</sup> His work of translation, augmentation, and continuation was completed before the middle of 381. His Latin translation proved to be more popular than the original Greek, for whereas Eusebius's original has perished almost without a trace, Jerome's version survives in dozens of manuscripts. It was used by countless western writers in late antiquity, the Middle Ages, and the early modern period and was for many writers their sole source of ancient history. And whereas in the East, Eusebius's *Canones* was attacked and rewritten on account of its divergent chronology, that same chronology,

<sup>96</sup> Two copies of the twelfth-century Armenian manuscript (E, Yerevan (Armenia), Matenadaran MS 1904) were made at the end of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries (N and G, called I by Christesen and Martirosova-Torlone 2006). There are also many other later witnesses to this Armenian text and tradition, including an unpublished tenth-century compilation (Yerevan (Armenia), Matenadaran MS 2679). See Drost-Abgarjan 2006 and Christesen and Martirosova-Torlone 2006: 49–54.

<sup>97</sup> The Armenian translation survives in the same twelfth-century manuscript (E) that preserves the Armenian version of the *Canones* (see previous note).

<sup>98</sup> Although it seems not to have been a chronicle, we should mention the Χρονικὴ ἐπιτομή (*Chronological Epitome*) of Heliconius of Byzantium, which extended from Adam to the reign of Theodosius the Great (395) in ten books (*Suda*, E 851; see also A 3215 and 3868). See Janiszewski 2006: 411–15. This work may have been the forerunner of the later Byzantine epitome history, like those of Eustathius of Epiphaneia, Malalas, Symeon the Logothete, and George the Monk (see Croke 1990a: 33 and 35–36, though he mistakenly extends Heliconius's history down to Theodosius II).

<sup>99</sup> See Volume III. See also Kelly 1975: 72–75, Mosshammer 1979: 37–38, 67–73, Donalson 1996, Burgess 2002, and Jeanjean and Lançon 2004. For Jerome's *Chronicle* in general, see Schöne 1900, though his study has been superseded in many important respects.

via Jerome's translation, became the standard chronology in the West, chiefly because there were no alternatives in Latin.

The importance of Jerome's version of Eusebius's *Canones* was not only that, for more than a thousand years, it gave western Christians a nearly complete history of the world and placed the Christian empire at its culmination. More generally, it also gave Christian writers and readers a new genre within which to explore history. The different Latin versions of the *Liber generationis* attest to a western interest in the genealogies of the Bible and the kingdoms tangential to it, even if Tertullian clearly wished to avoid such matters. However, no western genre provided such a wide sweep of history, both chronological and geographical, as did Jerome's, and no other work provided a history of Christianity and the Church.<sup>100</sup> More or less since its beginnings, history in Latin had meant the history of Rome and, later, the biographies of her emperors. No ecumenical tradition seems to have existed in Roman historiography, nor any discussion of Rome's place in the development of Mediterranean or world history. As Rome conquered more and more of the Mediterranean, one might have expected a burst of historical writing of the type that appeared in the Hellenistic world, but no such efflorescence ever took place.<sup>101</sup> Despite bringing most of the known world under their sway, the Romans were hopelessly parochial when it came to writing history, and even more so after the republic had evolved into monarchy.<sup>102</sup> For Latin Christians, whose sacred books were regarded in large part as historical documents relating thousands of years of the history of the Jewish people from the creation of the world, this approach to history was at best myopic and at worst irrelevant. In the East, Greek readers had a huge variety of histories, chronographies, and chronicles, old and new, that took a much more ecumenical view of the Mediterranean. They also had Christian histories. Latin readers lacked any such histories, either ecumenical or Christian, apart from the *Liber generationis* and Cornelius Nepos's romanized chronicle of Apollodorus, which, in lieu of anything better or more recent, was still being read at the end of the fourth century.

<sup>100</sup> Rufinus's translation of Eusebius's *HE* and Sulpicius Severus's *Chronica* were still almost twenty years away when Jerome wrote.

<sup>101</sup> The *Philippic Histories* of Pompeius Trogus and the *breviarium* of Velleius Paterculus are only partial exceptions.

<sup>102</sup> The chief exhibit here must be Tacitus's *Annales*, which manages to relate the history of the entire empire within the narrow confines of the palace and the senate, with only an occasional foray into a military camp. Cornell 2010 argues that the earliest Roman historians were not as parochial as later historians like Livy and Tacitus.

This fourth-century evidence for Nepos's continued use derives from the poet Ausonius, who in 372/75 sent a copy of this chronicle to the praetorian prefect, Probus (*Ep.* 9; R. Green 1991: 201). This is of great interest since we know that Ausonius wrote a chronicle of his own at an unknown date in the second half of the fourth century. Unfortunately, we know nothing about it other than the fact that it began with the creation of the world, which shows at least that it was a Christianized chronicle. Our only knowledge of it comes from Giovanni Mansionario's c. 1320 list of Ausonius's works: '(Scripsit) cronicam ab initio mundi usque ad tempus suum' (R. Green 1991: 720, lines 18–19). It may have been intended as a rival to Jerome's translation of Eusebius (as Croke 2001b: 300), and thus written after 382, but for all we know he could have written it before Jerome: after all, he had a copy of Nepos's *Chronica* in 372/75 and he knew, or at least knew of, the chronicle of Castor of Rhodes as well (*Professores*, 22. 7; R. Green 1991: 57 and 360; mid- to late 380s). So his chronicle may have been a Christianized version of Nepos and/or Castor. Whatever it was, and whether before or after Jerome, it had no influence that we can trace, and it was Jerome's chronicle that was the immediate starting point for all later Latin chronicles.

With Jerome, for the first time, western readers had not only a history that placed Rome in her Mediterranean context, but also a history of Christianity, one that put Rome into a Christian context. Events were dated not from the foundation of the city, but from the birth of Abraham, the first Christian. To offset the missing centuries before Abraham, later chroniclers filled in the gap from Creation or Adam, using either narrative or genealogical lists. What is more, compared to narrative history or biography, chronicles on the model of Jerome were easy to compose: one did not need an extensive literary education or rhetorical skills; one was not required to interview participants or do extensive research and preparation; and one did not need a detailed knowledge of far distant people, places, and events. Anyone with a pen and parchment could gather useful information, particularly if he chanced to be in or near one of the imperial capitals or along a well-travelled highway. Written sources — earlier chronicles or histories, episcopal lists, and letters and documents — made the job easier still. Because all men's deeds were part of the microcosm of God's plan, everything that happened, no matter how trivial, could be read as part of the narrative of human history. Chronicles could therefore be written about individuals whose importance was at best local, instead of kings, emperors, and popes, or about countries, regions, or individual monasteries or churches, instead of whole empires. Thus the focus of a copy of Eusebius-Jerome could shift, within a continuation or two, from the many Mediterranean kingdoms of the past, down to Rome and its empire, then down to the continuator's own

local region, for instance western Spain or southern Gaul. Consequently, as the connections among imperial provinces became weaker in the years during which central Roman government was dissolving, chronicles allowed a virtue to be made of necessity. This is, perhaps, the most important Christian contribution to the development of the chronicle genre.

In addition to their ease of composition, their flexibility and ease of use allowed chronicles to survive and become the dominant historiographical form throughout the Middle Ages. A work written in a chronicle format of regnal years could have many or few entries, could be written in a simple manner or in a high rhetorical style, could be composed of succinct entries or more detailed accounts, could include only a few entries per decade or many entries per year. As a genre, chronicles could encompass everything from the briefest of notes added to Easter tables to extensive annalistic records. As a result, anyone could be a historian and many took up the task.<sup>103</sup> What survives today is only a tiny fraction of what was originally written.<sup>104</sup>

Along with this easing of the barriers to writing history, the advantages that Cicero had already seen in the *Liber annalis* of Atticus were rediscovered: huge sweeps of history could be seen 'at a single glance' and readers could move forward and backward through history with ease. Chronicles allowed readers to use and understand history, secular, biblical, and Christian, in a fundamentally different way from narrative history, which could not really be used to learn history on any large scale. That is why so few ancient narrative histories survived the Middle Ages and why their manuscript traditions are usually so tenuous.<sup>105</sup> One might almost call the chronicle a democratization of history, allowing everyone, for the first time, to easily access and understand the scope of the Mediterranean, and later the European, past.

Only one difficulty obtruded. The most problematic aspect of Jerome's heritage was his chronological apparatus of imperial regnal years, Olympiads, and years from

<sup>103</sup> A clear recent analogy is to the punk and post-punk musical explosion from 1976 to 1982: once the barriers to being a musician were lowered, hundreds upon hundreds of people discovered that they had music they wanted to record for others to hear. Today's amateur political blogs and the fan-fiction phenomenon on the web are equally relevant.

<sup>104</sup> With the sole exception of the *Gallic Chronicle of 511*, the chronicles that were known and used at the beginning of the Middle Ages are the only ones that survive today. It was their general popularity in particular that led to their being recopied. Without being copied, they could not survive, like Ausonius's chronicle.

<sup>105</sup> Tacitus and Ammianus Marcellinus, for example, are largely known from single manuscripts (Reynolds 1983: 6–8, 406–11).

the birth of Abraham. Few of the authors whose works directly continued Jerome retained these systems, because the numbers for the most part meant nothing and regnal years were extremely hard to calculate. In the West, imperial regnal years had never been used for dating as they normally were in Egypt and the East. They caused many problems for the western chroniclers who tried to use them (particularly because many chroniclers had poor information about the exact lengths of imperial reigns). Olympiads meant nothing in the West either, since the Olympic Games, which had taken place in Achaea, had been abolished by Theodosius in 393. Consequently western chroniclers tended to continue Olympiad reckoning simply because they had found it in Jerome; adding a marginal numeral every fourth year was easy enough, even if the purpose for doing so was completely opaque. Finally, years of Abraham meant least of all to Jerome's continuators as they had been invented by Eusebius in order to provide a unifying chronology for the pre-imperial section of his work. But most later chronicles filled in the missing text between Creation and Abraham, so a system calculated from Abraham was not useful. Even in the Eusebian original, years of Abraham served no useful historical purpose after the accession of Augustus.

As a result, among extant chronicles, only Hydatius and the *Gallic Chronicle of 452* follow the full chronological apparatus of Eusebius-Jerome. Influenced by the popularity of consularia, Prosper and Marcellinus *comes* discarded Jerome's chronological apparatus and switched to the easier and more familiar system of consular dates, Prosper adding years since the crucifixion (a proto-AD system) and Marcellinus adding indictions. Their continuators followed suit with consuls, but with the demise of the annual consulate in 541 chroniclers were forced to resort to regnal years once again, a practice that was followed by many chroniclers in the early Middle Ages. Even then, however, the fundamental difficulties inherent in reckoning by regnal years prompted other chroniclers to seek out different systems. These writers adopted years since the birth of Christ, *anni domini*, from the new Dionysian Easter tables that began circulating more widely in the seventh and eighth centuries. This sequence became our modern AD system.<sup>106</sup> Isidore and Bede

<sup>106</sup> This system became standard for two reasons. First, it was universal, since Europe was entirely Christian. Second, and more important, the connection of each *annus domini* number to a unique date for Easter (within a 532-year cycle) meant that there could be (virtually) no confusion from country to country or city to city over what number was to be assigned to what year. As long as Dionysius's table was continued accurately everyone would agree on the *annus domini*. This was the first time in European history that there was a universal, agreed-upon, and accurate dating system that could be used by everyone, not just historians.



abandoned all such relative systems for their chronicle epitomes and simply used years from the creation of the world, *anni mundi*. That is exactly the sort of system that Eusebius had been trying to avoid when he set out his complicated, columnar vision of displaying past time, a vision far too complex for posterity to retain.

### *Summary*

This chapter has laid out the way in which a Christian chronicle tradition developed out of the apologetic literature of the Hellenistic and Jewish worlds, apologetic literature that was, by its very nature, chronographic. That is to say, chronography stood at the very heart of apologetic from the start, because the defence of, or *apologia* for, one's own people or religion always rested on proving its antiquity in contrast to any other. That line of argument was unavoidable throughout the ancient world, which assumed without question that older was better. If one could prove the case for temporal primacy, one unassailably proved the case for qualitative superiority. What that means is that the late antique chronographic traditions emerged smoothly out of existing chronographic apologetics. In so doing, however, the Christians did not invent the chronicle as a genre. As we saw in the last chapter, the writing of chronicles is very nearly as old as are Mediterranean writing traditions themselves. The achievement of the Christian Eusebius and the many authors in East and West who followed him was to reduce the diffuse argumentation of earlier chronographic apologetics to the rigours demanded by the chronicle format. In doing this, however, Latin authors very quickly began to draw upon the influence of another, more indigenous and somewhat less ancient, chronographic tradition, that of the Roman consularia, as we have already noted. It is that tradition that we examine in the following two chapters.



## THE EARLY DEVELOPMENT OF CALENDARS AND CONSULARIA

We must now shift back in time and leave the historiographical continuum that we have been following since the beginning of this volume. Having traced the antecedents of chronicles in a variety of Near Eastern and Mediterranean contexts, it is now time to turn to a native Latin chronographic form, the consularia.

### *Prolegomenon: Consular Dating in the Roman Empire*

Like the Assyrians and the Greeks, the Romans adopted a system of dating whereby years were named after annual magistrates. For the Romans, these were the annually elected consuls. Before the appearance of the consuls in c. 509 BC, the inhabitants of Rome probably accounted for the passage of the years with the regnal years of the kings, although we have no explicit evidence to this effect. After the expulsion of the kings (traditionally, at any rate, though the historical reality was probably rather different), the consuls were held to embody many of the powers of the king, particularly legislative and military, and were elected annually.<sup>1</sup> Eventually, the practice therefore arose of naming each year after the two ‘ordinary’ consuls (*consules ordinarii*, ‘regular consuls’). Thus the year that we call 63 BC was referred to by the Romans as ‘the year when M. Tullius Cicero and C. Antonius

<sup>1</sup> This is not the place to enter into the debate about the origins of the office of consul and whether following the end of the monarchy there was one or two, they were called consuls or praetors, or they served for a year or less. For a short overview, see Forsythe 2005: 150–55 with Wiseman 2007: 239.

Hybrida were consuls', or more precisely, 'M. Tullio Cicerone C. Antonio Hybrida coss', an ablative absolute phrase meaning 'Marcus Tullius Cicero (and) Gaius Antonius Hybrida (being) consuls'. When someone was consul for a second or third time (or seventeenth or eighteenth time as in the cases of the emperors Domitian or Theodosius II) this was registered with a numeral after the name, which marked the iteration. Thus 'Alexandro III et Dione II' (our AD 229) means that this year was the third consulship of the emperor Alexander and the second of Cassius Dio, the consular historian. Originally consular names were written in full, in apposition to the word *co(n)s(ulibus)*, as in the first example above, where the duplication of the letter 's' indicates two consuls. However, various short forms were often used in unofficial contexts and in literary references, usually a combination of *praenomen* and *nomen* (e.g. 'M. Tullio') or *praenomen* and *cognomen* (e.g. 'M. Cicerone'). Starting at the very end of the republic, the use of the *cognomen* alone came into fashion in very unofficial situations, like dates painted onto wine amphorae, with *et* connecting the two names, a style perpetuated into the imperial period. By the 90s AD, in fact, this form had started to appear even in official inscriptions and became quite common in official contexts by the second quarter of the second century. By the third century, it was perfectly normal, and by the fourth, it appears in virtually all consular dates preserved in the West.<sup>2</sup>

For modern people, the consular dating system seems awkward in the extreme. It is easy for us to say that since the Persian war started in 337 and ended in 363 it lasted about twenty-six years, but saying that it lasted from 'Feliciano et Titiano coss' to 'Iuliano Aug. III et Salustio coss' tells us nothing. The war could have been one year or one hundred years; the consular dates, unlike our numerical dates, do not intrinsically and automatically provide the information necessary for counting time. As a result, Romans had no means of referring to future years, and even working out the length of time between past consulates would have forced them to memorize the names of the recent consuls and keep enumerated lists.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>2</sup> This analysis is based on RWB's unpublished studies of all consular inscriptions in *CIL* and *AE*.

<sup>3</sup> See, for example, Cicero, *Pro Sestio*, 33: 'si appellandi sunt consules quos nemo est quin non modo ex memoria sed etiam ex fastis euellendos putet' ('if it is even right to call those men consuls who everyone thinks should be erased not only from men's memories, but from the fasti as well') and especially Velleius Paterculus 2. 53. 4: 'Quid aliud quam nimium occupatos dixerim, quos in aetate et tanti et paene nostri saeculi viri fefellit quinquennium, cum a C. Atilio et Q. Servilio consulibus tam facilis esset annorum digestio?' ('There are some who have made a miscalculation of five years in the age of a man who was so important and was also almost of our own generation

Nevertheless, even the Romans had problems with this system of dating. A particularly good example of this comes from a tombstone found in Tarraco (Alföldy 1975: 946). It states that Aventinus was forty years old when he died on 28 December 'ueniente cons(ulatu) Magni' ('the year before the consulate of Magnus'), having been born 'Honorii XIII et Theodosii X c(onsulatu)'. The year of Honorius's thirteenth consulship and Theodosius's tenth was 422, while the consulship of Magnus was 460. In other words, Aventinus died on 28 December 459, aged only thirty-seven. Knowing the consuls of the year of his birth and the year of his death still did not help the composer of the text calculate Aventinus's age correctly. It is obvious that it was known he was 'about forty' when he died and that, rather than the names of the consuls, provided the basis for the age assigned him in the inscription.

To make matters worse, from the early empire 'suffect' or substitute consuls were elected each year to replace the ordinary consuls at various, usually fixed, dates throughout the year. Until the very late republic, suffecti were only elected if a consul was removed from or died in office. But during the Triumviral period, and under Augustus and his successors, the multiplication of suffecti became necessary, both as a means of honouring supporters and in order to produce enough ex-consuls to staff provincial governorships. Although the ordinary consuls gave their names to the entire year for official empire-wide purposes, the names of suffecti came to be used in Rome itself to date the portions of the year after the ordinary consuls had resigned. Suffer dates also appear in military diplomas, issued at Rome for the use of honourably discharged auxiliary soldiers, but then diffused throughout the empire. As a result, in Rome, its environs, on diplomas, and occasionally elsewhere, any given year could be known officially by three, four, or five different pairs of names, although as far as we can tell, no lists of annual *suffecti* were ever compiled.<sup>4</sup> For this reason, we now know the names of many suffect pairs from inscriptions and military diplomas but have no certain idea in what year they held office.

Another complication to consular dating systems arose if, as sometimes happened, consuls were not appointed. In this case the year would be known as the year 'after the consulate of X and Y', the consuls of the previous year. Known to us as a post-consulate, these years are recorded in extant consular lists as 'p.c.' (for *post consulatum*) plus the names of the previous year's consuls in the genitive case

[i.e. Pompey]. What else could I say of these men other than that their attention must have been too preoccupied elsewhere? For calculating the years from the consulship of Gaius Atilius and Quintus Servilius was so easy!', trans. by Yardley and Barrett 2011: 73).

<sup>4</sup> See Eck 1991 for the details regarding dating with suffecti.

(which is to say, not the ablative absolute used in normal consular dates). If post-consulates multiplied, a succession of years would need to be designated with the same pair of consular names but a different post-consular numeral: thus ‘the second year after the consulate of X and Y’, ‘the third year after the consulate of X and Y’, and so on. This happened quite often in the West in the early sixth century and, after Justinian abolished the annual consulship in 541, reserving it for emperors in the year after their accessions, and after Basilius had served as the last private consul in Roman history in that same year, many people continued to date by his post-consulate, counting fifteen, twenty, and more years ‘p.c. Basili’.

Alternatives to consular dating had nothing like the same currency. Dates *ab urbe condita* were used on occasion by historians and in some other formal situations, for instance in the inscription of the *Acta* of the Arval Brethren, an ancient and long-defunct Roman religious guild revived by Augustus in a spirit of antiquarian self-legitimation, and in the *Fasti Capitolini*, described below and equally antiquarian in spirit. Save in these very particular — and politically significant — contexts, AUC dates were rarely used for ordinary dating, either privately or publicly.<sup>5</sup> There was a good reason for this. For however impractical consular dating may look to us, AUC dates were even less practical: they were calculated from an event that no one could actually date uncontroversially, and so there were as many different AUC systems as there were competing dates for the foundation of the city.<sup>6</sup> The standard date we use for modern AUC reckoning, the equivalent of our 753 BC, is said to derive from Varro, though as we shall see in Volume II, it almost certainly derives from Atticus; yet this Varronian (or rather Pomponian) chronology was only one of many competing AUC chronologies and is in fact probably less accurate than other options.<sup>7</sup> One would have expected the senate or later the emperor to have imposed a single AUC system for everyone to use, but that never happened, because consuls were sufficient. Again, we might have expected counting by

<sup>5</sup> See Feeney 2007: 140–41 and Frier 1979: 143 for its rare use by late republican historians apart from historic occasions. For its more frequent use by the early republican historians, see Frier 1979: 142–43 and Verbrugghe 1989: 214 n. 61 (Hemina, Gellius, and Piso).

<sup>6</sup> For a list of the various dates for the foundation and the authors who reported them, see ‘Chapter 4, note 6’ in the Appendices to the Footnotes, pp. 371–73 below.

<sup>7</sup> As we shall see in Volume II, the accepted modern Varronian system includes four ‘dictator years’ (333, 324, 309, and 301 BC) that are patently fictitious: no matter where one looks, the events of these years go unmentioned in absolutely every ancient and modern history for the good reason that the years do not exist outside of two consular lists (*Fasti Capitolini* and the *fasti* of the *Chronograph* of 354). But the system that includes them has become too entrenched now to be changed.

regnal years or the annual renewal of the emperor's tribunician power to have become normal. Imperial regnal years were indeed used in certain areas of the East, especially in Egypt, but that was just a Hellenistic (and earlier) precedent.<sup>8</sup> Augustus himself attempted to establish the use of his tribunician renewal dates late in his reign, as we can see in the *Fasti Capitolini*, while M. Silanus unsuccessfully suggested the same thing to the senate in 22 under Tiberius, but dating by the annual renewal of the emperor's tribunician power never took hold.<sup>9</sup> Indictions, the fifteen-year tax cycle regularized by Diocletian, also came from the fourth century to be used widely throughout the East, surviving late into the Byzantine period as a relative chronology.<sup>10</sup> Yet neither system gained any significant diffusion in the West until after the imperial period.<sup>11</sup> The widespread use of regnal years in fourth- and fifth-century chronicles derives not from contemporary western usage, but from the enumeration of kings and emperors in the *Chronici canones* of Eusebius-Jerome. In other words, whatever problems we may have in using consular dates, they served the Romans reasonably well for around 1050 years (from c. 509 BC to AD 541) and no other system ever gained widespread currency in the western empire.

### *Calendars, Consularia, and Roman Antiquarianism in the Late Republic and Early Empire*

#### **Painted and Epigraphic Calendars**

Before we can turn to the development of consular *fasti* and *consularia* in the early empire, we should first set the stage by examining a very closely related genre, the calendar. Calendars and *consularia* frequently appeared together in the Roman and municipal fora of the early empire, both were produced in response to the same cultural and political impulses, and both derived from the same ultimate sources.<sup>12</sup>

<sup>8</sup> See Bagnall and Worp 2004: 43–54, 223–71.

<sup>9</sup> Tacitus, *Annals*, 3. 57. 1.

<sup>10</sup> For a short account of indictions, see *ODB*, 993. More detail can be found in Bagnall and Worp 2004: 7–42.

<sup>11</sup> For reasons not at all easy to determine, indictions gained a foothold in Spain and Gaul in the late fifth and sixth centuries — after these provinces had ceased to be governed by the western emperors — and became an important system of short-term reckoning in various legal and economic documents of the early Middle Ages.

<sup>12</sup> Feeney 2007: 168–70.

Unlike consular *fasti* and *consularia*, calendars have been widely studied, and an examination, although necessarily lengthy, provides a fundamental context within which to place our analysis of the *fasti* and *consularia*. What might seem like a digression on the well-understood historical context of extant calendars is in fact a necessary prolegomenon for exploring the generally unknown context of *fasti* and *consularia*.

No one would deny that a calendar is a fundamentally practical and useful tool. Modern calendars are decorated with such things as cats, motorcycles, movie stars, and bikini-clad models, but that is simply an attempt to make a dull block of annotated squares more attractive while it hangs on our walls. Calendars are valuable not primarily as aesthetic objects, but rather as a guide to the progression of days and the dates of generally recognized holidays. The open squares allow us to add our own important dates and appointments. We naturally tend to conceptualize Roman calendars in similar terms, but the Roman calendar — as a chronological and holiday guide, and equally as a guide to the dates of Rome's most important public rituals — was as culturally specific as our own. Ancient evidence for inscribed and painted calendars makes this clear.

Forty-eight inscribed calendars or fragments of inscribed calendars survive from the Roman world. This might seem unremarkable, given that we assume calendars to have a practical value and given that in the ancient world, important lasting records had to be inscribed on stone. Immediately, however, important peculiarities of geography and chronology obtrude. First of all, with a single exception, every known Roman calendar has been found in Italy; of those Italian calendars, all but six were found in the vicinity of Rome itself.<sup>13</sup> Stranger still is the chronological distribution of these calendars. The *Fasti Antiates maiores* dates between 67 and 55 BC and is our only surviving pre-Julian calendar; the *Fasti Pighiani* dates from the reign of Caligula; the *Fasti Sorrinenses minores* may date from the reign of Claudius; the *Fasti Lanuvini* may be of the second century; and a painted calendar from S. Maria Maggiore in Rome dates from the late second or early third

<sup>13</sup> There is a map of calendars in the endpapers of Rüpke 1995b. Of the forty-eight calendars listed (discounting the later manuscript calendars of the *Chronograph of 354* and Polemius Silvius), twenty-six were found in Rome. Three were found in the north of Italy (*Fasti Guidizzolenses*, *Fasti Palatii Urbinatis*, and *Fasti Cuprenses*), two in the south (*Fasti Venusini* and *Fasti Tarentini*), and one in Sicily (*Fasti Tauromenitani*). The remaining sixteen were found around Rome from Sorrina to the north-west, Amiternum in the north-east, to Nola in the south. For the texts, see Degraffi 1963: 1–236. Taylor and Holland 1952: 138 suggest that there may also have been a consular list like the *Fasti Capitolini* and perhaps a calendar inscribed on the arch of Janus in the Forum Transitorium by Nerva.



century.<sup>14</sup> With these five exceptions, every other extant calendar — more than forty of them — belongs to the reigns of Augustus and Tiberius.

These peculiarities of geographical and chronological distribution require explanation, and hints can be found in the history of the Roman calendar. At least down to the time of Varro, if not later, the divisions of the months (kalends, nones, and ides) and the dates of the annual religious festivals had always been officially proclaimed in Rome by the *rex sacrorum* on the nones of every month, for which reason there had been no real need for published calendars throughout most of the republic.<sup>15</sup> Besides, only city dwellers needed such calendrical information; rural people like farmers used the stars.<sup>16</sup> Indeed until the details were secretly copied and published by Cn. Flavius in c. 304 BC, a detailed calendar of the type we see in the surviving inscriptions literally could not have been created.<sup>17</sup> The *rex sacrorum* and the pontifex maximus did not believe it was in their interests to have the calendar published, presumably because to do so would have interfered with their ability to control the political schedule of the year. It is clear, in other words, that people managed to get along without inscribed calendars until the very end of the republic and that they did so again after the early Julio-Claudian period, no doubt by consulting neighbours, priests, local officials, handwritten or painted copies, and

<sup>14</sup> See the map in the endpapers of Rüpke 1995b as well as, respectively, pp. 43–44, 346–52, 84–85, 125–26, 149–51, and 86–90, the last with Salzman 1990: 7–8. See also Rüpke 1995b: 163 for the wide range of possible dates of the Fasti Guidizzolenses.

<sup>15</sup> See Michels 1967: 19–21, Scheid 1992: 119–20, and Pasco-Pranger 2006: 109–10. The kalends were marked by sacrifices by the *rex*.

<sup>16</sup> See Michels 1967: 16 n. 19 on the use of the calendar as a guide for the religious, political, legal, and business activities of urban Roman citizens only; see Brind'Amour 1983: 132–39 and Hannah 2005: 114–16 on the astronomical agricultural calendar. Those farmers and townsfolk from outside Rome who were rich enough to have business dealings in Rome itself needed to know when the market days were, days for legal disputes, and the dates of the important agricultural festivals (or rather their *vilici* did). Cato (*De agri cultura*, 146–50) indicates the need for a basic knowledge of the calendar, little more than the kalends of certain months, though in section 150 he expects that *vilici* will know if there has been an intercalation as well (which, from Cicero's evidence at *Ep. ad Atticum*, 5. 21, was perhaps expecting too much). No doubt, like city dwellers, they consulted with neighbours and checked *ferialia*, bare lists of festivals with their dates that were copied onto wax codices or a papyrus or parchment roll, like the Feriale Duranum (see Volume II), but it is most unlikely that they would have travelled to the nearest forum to check an inscribed calendar for such information, as we shall see.

<sup>17</sup> See Michels 1967: 108–18 and Rüpke 1995b: 245–74.

*ferialia*. How, then, do we account for the sudden interest in inscribed calendars under Augustus and Tiberius in the territories around Rome?

One obvious explanation presents itself immediately: on 1 January 45 BC Julius Caesar introduced Rome and Italy to a new, accurate calendar. He added extra days to the very ends of the short months to extend the calendar from 355 to 365.25 days; he then redated all the religious festivals that fell after the ides in the altered months so that they would continue to fall the same number of days into the month (that is, after the ides) as they always had. Thus, an event that had taken place the day after the ides of January ('id. Ian.' = 13 January) in the old calendar had its date changed from 'XVII kal. Feb.' (seventeen days before the kalends of February) to 'XVIII kal. Feb.' (nineteen days before the kalends of February) in the new calendar. It would thus continue to be commemorated on the day after the ides (14 January), in spite of the fact that two new days had been added to the end of the month. Naturally, therefore, any date after the ides in these months would be affected by the added days, and this included all anniversaries, birthdays among them.<sup>18</sup> Could it simply have been this calendrical revision that inspired these inscribed calendars? Were they, in other words, set up by individuals or municipal governments to publicize the new calendar and thus help their fellow citizens to keep track of important religious commemorations whose dates (but not days) had been altered? With our entirely practical view of a calendar's purpose, this sort of explanation seems quite natural to us. Indeed, many have assumed it to be correct, but unfortunately there is no evidence to support it. As we shall see, in fact, ideology and the public display of it will account for the spate of Augustan and Tiberian calendars more than will any practical explanation.

### *The Calendar of M. Fulvius Nobilior*

The pattern for all later inscribed calendars was in fact set by the very first public written calendar for which we have any evidence. In the second half of the 180s BC, M. Fulvius Nobilior — consul in 189, victor that year over Ambracia in Aetolia, triumphator in 187, and censor in 179–178 — built the circular *aedes Herculis Musarum*, that is, a temple to 'Hercules (Tutor) of the Muses'. This μουσεῖον faced the north side of the Circus Flaminius, in the southern corner of the Campus Martius, and in it Fulvius placed statues of the nine Muses and of Hercules playing a lyre (all pillaged from Pyrrhus's palace in Ambracia), along with the

<sup>18</sup> For this phenomenon, and the decisions it forced on public figures like Augustus and Livia, see the excellent discussion of Feeney 2007: 153–56.

bronze *aedicula* of the Camenae (water goddesses that were treated as the Roman equivalent of the Muses) that was said to have come from the time of Numa and had been housed in the Temple of Honos et Virtus since being struck by lightning in the distant past.<sup>19</sup> More important for our purposes, Fulvius decorated the interior walls of this temple with a painted calendar. This was preceded by a short calendrical commentary on the names of the months in the form of a dedication, and consular fasti (which would probably have included the censors and *lustra* as well), originally running down either to Fulvius's consulship or to the year of his triumph.<sup>20</sup> Although modern scholarship associates this temple and these texts closely with the poet Q. Ennius, who had accompanied Fulvius on his campaign against Ambracia, they were certainly the result of antiquarian research undertaken by Fulvius himself, under whose name the calendar commentary fragments are always quoted.<sup>21</sup> 'The integration of calendar, temple-dedication, and the annalistic display of the names of those nobles who had reached the highest magistracies had no precedent in Rome: it was a Fulvian innovation.'<sup>22</sup> Soon afterwards and for

<sup>19</sup> See Coarelli 1997: 364 and 552 (maps), 452–84, as well as Richardson 1977 (who argues that Hercules was not part of the original dedication), and Richardson 1992: 187. See also the summary with bibliography of Gildenhard 2007: 84, Sciarrino 2004, and particularly Fabrizi 2008: 196–203. Further discussion on the date of the construction of this temple can be found in 'Chapter 4, note 19' in the Appendices to the Footnotes, pp. 373–74 below.

<sup>20</sup> It is too often forgotten that the surviving examples of the republican and earliest Augustan fasti traditions almost always included censors and the completion or non-completion of the *lustra*: the Fasti Capitolini, Fasti Antiates maiores, Fasti Amiternini, Fasti Amerini, Fasti Colotiani, and Fasti magistrorum uici, of which the latter, in fact, has the 'title' of 'Consules censores ab Imperatore Caesare pontifice maximo' ('Consuls and censors from [the arrival of] Emperor Caesar Pontifex Maximus'). See Feeney 2007: 176–77.

<sup>21</sup> For all the above, see inter alia Michels 1967: 124–25; Wiseman 1979: 15, 17; Gratwick 1982: 63–67; Rüpke 1995b: 331–68; Rüpke 1995a: 199–202; Feeney 1998: 124 n. 39: 'surely the work of Ennius'; Gildenhard 2003: 94–97; Rüpke 2006; Rossi and Breed 2006: 407–10; Gildenhard 2007: 84–85; Fabrizi 2008: 196–203, 214–16; and Feeney 2007: 169–70 for the appearance of consular fasti in the temple. Note that Rüpke was eventually only partially persuaded by Feeney's arguments concerning the appearance in the temple of complete fasti back to 509 BC, made in personal communications: cf. Feeney 2007: 287–88 n. 25 and Rüpke 2006: 509 n. 45. Rüpke believes that a complete consular list back to the beginning of the republic was the work of only the later second and first centuries BC, culminating in the Fasti Capitolini, a clearly untenable belief. A short commentary on the often circumstantial nature of the evidence for Fulvius's fasti can be found in 'Chapter 4, note 21' in the Appendices to the Footnotes, pp. 374–75 below.

<sup>22</sup> Gildenhard 2003: 95. See Sehlmeier 2003: 159–70 for Fulvius as the earliest writer in the Roman antiquarian tradition, though he is better regarded as both antiquarian and historian. Note

much of the next decade, Ennius utilized these and no doubt other antiquarian researches of Fulvius to compose his famous verse history of Rome, the *Annales*, and important connections among the *Annales*, the temple, and Fulvius's fasti bear examination. Among many poetical innovations, the *Annales* was the first detailed Latin history of Rome from its very beginnings that we know of and the first text to bear the title *Annales*.<sup>23</sup> It was also the first to use consular dates for chronology of the distant past.<sup>24</sup> Later the consular fasti in Fulvius's temple seem to have been extended to 174 or 173 BC and the commemorations of the calendar updated, just as the *Annales* were updated at the end of Ennius's life.<sup>25</sup>

These painted texts obviously possessed some intrinsic practical value, simply because they set out the day-to-day functioning of Rome's religious and civic life; it would indeed have been possible for someone who was unsure of whether the next day was legal for business or not to go down to the Campus Martius and check Fulvius's calendar.<sup>26</sup> But it is surely more likely that such a person would have continued to do what he had done before the temple was finished: ask someone else or check a *feriale*. For it was not, after all, Fulvius's intention to help Romans determine the date of *Terminalia*, whether business was legal or not on the ides of

that he is with Ennius the earliest writer to have established a date for the foundation of Rome (see 'Chapter 4, note 6' in the Appendices to the Footnotes, pp. 371–72 below).

<sup>23</sup> For Ennius and the title *Annales*, see 'Chapter 4, note 23' in the Appendices to the Footnotes, p. 375 below.

<sup>24</sup> For the consuls, see Skutsch 1985: 6, with lines 290, 302–05, 324, and 329. Consuls' names must also have been associated with the reference to the eclipse of 21 June 400 BC (fragment line 153). Had they not been, Cicero would have been unable to date the line (*De re publica*, 1. 25). Since Ennius did not use AUC dates (Skutsch 1985: 312, with 311–14 for the eclipse), it was Cicero himself who equated the consuls with the year AUC, probably via the chronicle of Nepos.

<sup>25</sup> The standard view is that Ennius added three books to his original fifteen after 173 BC (his sixty-seventh year, thus just a few years before his death in c. 169), but this is a modern reconstruction based on conflicting ancient testimony (Zetzel 2007: 13–14). For the date of 173 BC with reference to the temple's fasti, see Rüpke 1995b: 43–44, 346–52; Rüpke 2006: 509; and Rossi and Breed 2006: 402, 409–11. Cf. also Feeney 2007: 287–88 n. 25. The Fasti Antiatres maiores (see 'Chapter 4, note 21' in the Appendices to the Footnotes, pp. 374–75 below) appears to be missing eleven lines before the consuls and censors of 164 BC (Degrassi 1947: 161). Since there were no suffects and a single censorial year in those eleven lines, and since a censorial year took up three lines, these fasti must have begun with the year 173 BC.

<sup>26</sup> It remains the case that the only explicit evidence we have for anyone citing epigraphic or painted calendars comes from Macrobius, *Saturnalia*, 1. 12. 30, which cites the Fasti Aricini and Fasti Praenestini for their calendar commentaries, not their calendars.

September, or who the consuls were fifteen years ago. The plan was clearly something quite different. The idea of a public calendar was in the first place no doubt inspired by the temple's connections with Numa, who was believed to have revised Rome's first calendar and whose *aedicula* Fulvius had 'rescued' and housed in his new temple.<sup>27</sup> The removal of this *aedicula* to the new temple was no doubt inspired by Numa's well-known connections to the Camenae and Egeria. The idea of a Museum, a temple to the Muses (rather than to Numa's Camenae), will have been inspired by Fulvius's time in Greece and reflected second-century Rome's new rage for Greek culture. On the other hand, because the temple was also a celebration of Fulvius's — and Rome's — victory over Aetolia, it offered through its calendar and consular *fasti* a triumphant and fundamentally Roman view of the Roman past that had led up to that conquest.<sup>28</sup> Despite the pseudo-Greek setting, the calendar and the consuls were quintessentially Roman and therefore offered a quintessentially Roman way of displaying, describing, and interpreting the past; all of which, in this instance, was seen to lead up to Fulvius. But the idea of compiling a list of magistrates — consuls and censors — at a time before there was any real historiographical need for one, is very Greek.<sup>29</sup>

<sup>27</sup> Numa is said to have taken Romulus's original 304-day calendar and added two months, January and February, thus expanding it to 355 days, as it was in Fulvius's day. For the connection between Numa and Fulvius's calendar, see Richardson 1977: 357–58 and Michels 1967: 121–25. Numa, too, appears in *Annales* 113–19 (Skutsch 1985: 263–71). For Fulvius, Ennius, and the Muses, see Skutsch 1985: 144–46.

<sup>28</sup> Apart from temple dedications, the calendar at this time also noted the three most important events in Roman history: the expulsion of the kings (*Regifugium*, 24 February), the foundation of Rome (21 April), and the battle of the River Allia, which led to the sack of Rome by the Senones in 386 (18 July; *Alliensis dies*). Rüpké 2006: 510: 'The *fasti* is imbued with Romanness, Roman gods, Roman consuls, Roman victories, and Roman history. It is a part of a decorative program that commemorates Roman victories over the Aetolians, that is, over Greeks. At the same time, however, the project is utterly "Greek". This holds true not only for the presence of the Greek Muses brought from Ambracia and the Greek conception of Hercules as tutelary deity of the arts, but also for the exploitation of writing[...]. It was a new idea for history not to be narrated orally but to be written down.' For the Homeric and Hellenistic background to the *Annales*, see e.g. Gildenhard 2003; Rossi and Breed 2006: 412–18; Sciarrino 2006; Gildenhard 2007: 75–80, 84–85; Elliott 2010: 149–53; Fabrizi 2008: 203–14, who emphasizes the temple's connections with Pythagoras and its possible artistic role as a base for Rome's *collegium poetarum* (the connection between Numa and Pythagoras would have been very strong at this time: see Chapter 2, note 95); and Coarelli 1997: 461–73, 483–84.

<sup>29</sup> Gildenhard 2007: 84 n. 73: '[T]o represent the evolution of a civic community in time by means of a list matching years with eponymous magistrates' was 'a Greek idea', and it must be said that the Greeks certainly loved such lists, whether of magistrates or individuals like Olympic victors,

The calendar, with its dedication-commentary on the names of the months and its consular fasti, must therefore be interpreted first as a work of scholarship and antiquarianism, and second as a work of personal aggrandizement.<sup>30</sup> It was, one might say, a sort of panegyric to Fulvius and Rome, displayed in a Greek setting, intimately connected with the inception of Ennius's composition of the *Annales*, which in its first edition appears to have ended with Fulvius and his construction of Hercules' temple.<sup>31</sup> The temple painting was in every way a first draft of the *Annales* — a basic historical text that established the framework around which the *Annales* was built.<sup>32</sup>

### *The Calendar of M. Verrius Flaccus*

Another example of a linked calendar, commentary, and consular fasti was composed by M. Verrius Flaccus, a famous freedman *grammaticus* who was brought to Rome by Augustus to teach his adoptive children Gaius and Lucius (the sons of Agrippa and Julia) for a large annual fee. Flaccus's texts were erected between AD 6 and 9 (with a continuation added between 10 and 22) and are known as the Fasti Praenestini.<sup>33</sup> Like the fasti of Fulvius, the main purpose of these texts was not practical (though, again, nothing prevented them from being used for practical purposes). That is made clear by the presence of the lengthy commentary, by the shape of the inscription, and in particular by the presence of a now-lost statue of

as we saw in Chapter 2. By the 180s, there was a long tradition of such works that could have inspired Fulvius and such later authors as C. Sempronius Tuditanus, who wrote a *Liber magistratum* about fifty years later (Chassignet 1999: xxviii–xxxiii).

<sup>30</sup> For the fundamentally antiquarian nature of this early painted calendar and later calendars, see Rawson 1985: 234.

<sup>31</sup> Gratwick 1982: 65, Skutsch 1985: 553, Gildenhard 2003: 95–97, Sciarrino 2006: 462, and Rossi and Breed 2006: 411–12. For the important connections between the temple and the *Annales*, see Gratwick 1982: 63–67; Skutsch 1985: 143–53, 263–64, 649–50; Feeney 2007: 144, 275 n. 44; Rossi and Breed 2006: 407–12; Rüpke 2006: 508–12; Gildenhard 2007: 84–86; Feeney 2007: 143–44, 168–70; and Fabrizi 2008.

<sup>32</sup> Perhaps strangely, the relationship of the temple fasti to Ennius's poem is actually closely paralleled by the much later relationship between Eusebius's *Chronographia* and his subsequent *Chronici canones*, even to the extent that most of the *Chronographia* was not the work of Eusebius himself.

<sup>33</sup> For the texts of this calendar and commentary, see Degrassi 1963: 110–40; for an updated description, Rüpke 1995b: 114–23. For the consular fasti, Degrassi 1947: 260. See also Feeney 1998: 124–25 and A. Wallace-Hadrill 1987: 225–26, with A. Wallace-Hadrill 2008: 243–58 on knowledge and power in Augustan Rome.

Flaccus near the inscription: 'Statuam habet Praeneste, in superiore fori parte circa hemicyclium, in quo fastos a se ordinatos et marmareo pariete incisos publicarat' ('His statue stands at Praeneste in the upper part of the forum near the hemicycle on which he exhibited the fasti which he had arranged and inscribed upon its marble walls').<sup>34</sup> The monument took the form of a semicircle so that a viewer could stand and easily read the entire (large) work without moving, an unnecessary complication if readers were simply meant to obtain practical information, one day or month at a time. At the same time, the monumental form brought the focus clearly onto the statue of Flaccus himself. As had been the case with the calendar of Fulvius Nobilior, the characteristics of scholarship, antiquarianism, and personal aggrandizement are inextricably bound together.<sup>35</sup> The calendar and the consuls were quintessentially Roman, and an inscription presenting a personalized version of these texts to one's fellow citizens was the equivalent of erecting a statute of oneself clad in a toga, the ultimate declaration of Roman citizenship.<sup>36</sup> Flaccus the freedman was clearly proud of his accomplishments: he erected the inscription *and* a statue.

But we must not forget that Flaccus had been a tutor to Augustus's adopted sons, and therefore his choice of a calendar, rather than any other scholarly text (for he was a polymath, second only to Varro in learning), must be seen as a 'monumental tribute to the Julian calendar and cult, its connection with the traditional religion, its practicality and reliability'.<sup>37</sup> Thus, like Fulvius, Flaccus was also making a political statement with his calendar, though times had changed and the statement was necessarily different.<sup>38</sup>

<sup>34</sup> Suetonius, *De grammaticis*, 17. Translation from the Loeb (slightly modified), p. 423, which is clearly translating the text offered here (printed in the various Teubner editions), not the Latin text on the facing page. Here 'fasti' nicely encompasses both the calendar and the list of consuls, just as seems to be the case with Fulvius's 'fasti' mentioned by Macrobius (see 'Chapter 4, note 21' in the Appendices to the Footnotes, pp. 374–75 below). For a discussion of the archaeological remains of the hemicycle, see Coarelli 1996.

<sup>35</sup> Feeney 1998: 124–25: 'The inscription was placed in the forum of Praeneste, at the centre of the city's public life, but it was arranged in a semi-circle which acted as a focus for the statue of Verrius Flaccus himself [...]. The architectural complex beautifies and in some sense serves the state, but it simultaneously immortalises and exalts the freedman scholar who created it, together with his skills and techniques.'

<sup>36</sup> For the right to erect an inscription as one fundamental advertisement of legal Romanness, namely the possession of citizenship, see Meyer 1990.

<sup>37</sup> Geraldine Herbert-Brown, personal communication.

<sup>38</sup> As Frier 1979: 37 n. 18 says, 'Much of [Flaccus's] work seems to be in close relation to the political program of Augustus'.

### *Private Not Official Calendars*

The painted and inscribed calendars and consular *fasti* of Fulvius and Flaccus thus provide the paradigm for all such works: they were intended to reflect on the donor, on his interest in and dedication to the *res publica* and its leaders, and, in particular — because of the very Roman nature of these works — on his Roman-ness. Further analysis confirms this view. As Feeney and others have argued, ritual is the fundamentally Roman core of Roman religion.<sup>39</sup> The Roman calendar was in its origin a chronological guide to Roman ritual practice, that is, to the dates of the festivals. However, although calendars reflected Roman cult practice by noting the dates of festivals and could serve as aides-memoire to cult, that was not their fundamental purpose.<sup>40</sup> A careful comparison of the various surviving calendars reveals many differences among them, often quite important ones. In many cases, the calendars of local communities in Rome and elsewhere displayed incorrect information about the legal status of the days of the month or lacked notices for certain festivals; if these calendars were used as the local ‘official’ copy upon which locals based their observances of the festivals, then some commemorations and rituals could not have been celebrated correctly and others could not have been celebrated at all. Our extant calendars are for the most part very similar, but they are not similar enough to have guaranteed proper and accurate observation of religious festivals or the legal status of given days.<sup>41</sup>

Even worse, as we shall see below, the one constant fact of the early imperial calendar was its constant change. The senate and the emperors were forever adding new commemorations, while later calendars show that old commemorations were abolished to make way for the new. Any inscribed calendar would quickly have fallen out of date. We have proof that some calendars were updated as new commemorations were added, but most clearly were not. Every passing decade meant

<sup>39</sup> Feeney 1998: 116–17.

<sup>40</sup> Feeney 1998: 124: ‘[T]hese painted or carved calendars were themselves by no means religious or cult documents in any straightforward sense. They were memorials, without authority. They alluded to, commented upon, and commemorated the mechanisms by which state cult was regulated, but they were themselves not those mechanisms.’

<sup>41</sup> See Scheid 1992: 121: ‘[these] errors — on very important points, I insist — disqualify the written *fasti* from the technical status of ritual documents: the religious consequences would have been too serious. The impression is that the calendars displayed in public places were more symbolic and ornamental than ritually prescriptive and duly controlled by the priests’; Feeney 1998: 123–25; S. Green 2004: 7–8, with n. 11; and Pasco-Pranger 2006: 4. The variants among the extant calendars are seen most easily in the appendix of Michels 1967: 173–87.



that the calendars could be relied upon less and less as an accurate, and therefore practical, guide to the religious and civic life of the capital. Had any 'official' calendars existed, they would have to have been updated constantly and eventually replaced by new ones. But we can observe no such regular cycle: there was a boom under Augustus during which many calendars were erected, then a tailing-off period during which some were erected and a few were updated under Tiberius. Then production ceased altogether. Clearly a saturation point had been reached, where every forum that could support a calendar had one. There was always room for a togate statue of some new public benefactor, but how many calendars could any one town practically exhibit? And if forty-eight survive, how many more must there once have been? Once the craze had subsided and those eager to make a name for themselves no longer saw any value in erecting calendars, new methods were found to achieve the same ends.

Obviously, then, these calendars were not engraved and erected by any 'official' body, whether the town council or board of local *flamines* or *pontifices*. Had they been, then the local diversity and the frequent mistakes would have been intolerable and only the latest, updated versions of the calendars would survive, not the earliest, out-of-date ones. Instead, all the evidence of the surviving fragments argues for private dedications, erected for specific personal reasons at specific times, just as the calendars of Fulvius and Flaccus had been. That, in turn, explains the diversity and the errors. When one is glorifying one's own wealth, status, and Roman-ness alongside the *res publica* and its rulers — and not erecting a timetable for the ritual, political, and commercial conduct of an entire society — the sorts of mistakes we find in the extant calendars are of no consequence.

The private impetus behind our extant documents produces an important corollary: no 'master copy' from which local copies were produced can ever have existed, whether kept in Rome or elsewhere.<sup>42</sup> In this respect, extant calendars differ dramatically from the inscribed municipal constitutions extant from half a dozen Spanish sites, for there a single model text does seem to have been adjusted in minor ways to suit the needs of different communities, and it is difficult to postulate any source for this text other than the imperial governments in Mérida, Córdoba, and Tarragona.<sup>43</sup> In contrast with these urban constitutions, however,

<sup>42</sup> See previous note. We do not deny that a master copy of the calendar must have been kept by the *rex sacrorum* or the *pontifex maximus*, no doubt in the Regia, but our point here is that this was not displayed or made available to those who wanted copies, nor were copies made of it and sent out every time the calendar changed.

<sup>43</sup> The evidence is collected most conveniently in González 1990.

each extant calendar was composed from scratch to mirror the calendar of Rome (see below). Part of the pride that donors took in presenting these works to their fellow citizens no doubt derived from this very laboriousness: it was no easy task to assemble and organize these complex texts, and it was undoubtedly very expensive to have them inscribed, or even painted.

As just noted, these calendars are the calendars of Rome. Yet nearly half the extant examples were not erected in Rome: they were originally put up in towns and cities where the dates and festivals they recorded for commemoration had no local significance since they were particular only to the city of Rome itself. Equally important, no local date or festival was added to any of these local monumental calendars.<sup>44</sup> Therefore, as functional calendars almost half of these inscriptions were completely useless. Again, the contrast with important and truly practical texts, like the municipal constitutions from Spain noted above, could not be greater.

The Romanocentric content of these calendars in turn explains their physical concentration in and around Rome: the religious and legal details of the calendar in Rome meant nothing to provincials at any distance from the city. Most had probably never even seen a Roman calendar. By contrast, in Rome and especially its nearer environs whence people actually went to Rome for business or legal proceedings and watched or participated in its festivals, the calendar that prescribed these festivals held both social and cultural meaning. A togate statue said 'Roman' everywhere in the empire, since every citizen had to wear one. But only those in the actual environs of Rome would recognize a Roman calendar and understand its deep connections to Roman history and Roman ritual, and therefore to Roman identity. These are the people who erected in the centres of their own communities copies not just of a Roman calendar, but of the calendar of the city of Rome, an important distinction in this context.<sup>45</sup> We can thus see the importance of the calendar to men like Fulvius, consul, triumphator, censor, and victor over Aetolia; Ennius, a Messapian and new Roman citizen in 184; and Flaccus, an ex-slave recently retired from the employment of the emperor. The anonymous men who erected our other extant inscriptions will have been in similar positions.

Prestige, not practicality, was the chief concern, and a final piece of evidence for the lack of a practical purpose behind these calendars comes from the two manuscript calendars that survive from the fourth and fifth centuries: the calendar of the *Chronograph of 354* (compiled in Rome in 354) and the *Laterculus* of Polemius

<sup>44</sup> Feeney 1998: 125 n. 41 and Rüpke 2004: 33, who rightly contrasts this universality with 'the primarily local character of ancient societies'.

<sup>45</sup> Rüpke 2004: 32–34.

Silvius (compiled in Gaul in 448–49).<sup>46</sup> These late antique calendars demonstrate a continuous written tradition of imperial commemoration going back to the time of Julius Caesar, for they preserve many birthdays and accession dates that had been continuously commemorated in Rome from the early and middle empire down to the middle of the fourth century. It is clear from their inclusion of contemporary, fourth-century ceremonies that both derive from living fourth-century calendars, not repeatedly copied relics of a dead past.<sup>47</sup> Yet neither of these calendars appears in a chronological, religious, or administrative context. The calendar of the Roman *Chronograph of 354* appears in a chronological compendium produced by Filocalus, while the other is included within the *Laterculus* of Polemius Silvius, a surprisingly varied compendium of interesting historical, geographical, linguistic, and other information. Each of the two calendars thus exists solely for its antiquarian and Roman value, not for any practical or utilitarian purpose.<sup>48</sup> The antiquarian origin of these documents is demonstrated most clearly by the calendar of Polemius Silvius, which jettisons much of the useful ritual and chronological calendrical material that had only been kept up to date to the reign of Julian anyway, replacing it with antiquarian explanations and meteorological content. This impression is confirmed by the commemorations of the birthdays of Cicero and Virgil (3 January and 14 October), which had certainly never been officially celebrated by anyone in Rome or Gaul.

These late antique calendars, therefore, must not be seen as religious, civic, or chronological objects at all. Their purpose, particularly that of Filocalus, was to set out a particular historical vision of the Roman past and of Roman identity by means of antiquarian description and the moments, events, and people chosen for calendrical commemoration. Since the calendar was an annual cycle, it presented the Roman past not in a linear or progressive fashion, but rather as a total vision linking the present with deep historical antecedents, and thus placing the individual who produced the calendar and the one who read it into a personal, historical relationship to the Roman past.<sup>49</sup> What holds true of Filocalus's late antique

<sup>46</sup> These calendars will be discussed at length in Volume II. Text: Degraffi 1963: 238–61 and 264–75.

<sup>47</sup> Though the calendar of Polemius was, by the middle of the fifth century, just such a work: its latest commemoration dates to the reign of Julian.

<sup>48</sup> See Salzman 1990: 14–16, 56–60, 114–15.

<sup>49</sup> Beard 1987: 1, 7, 11–12; A. Wallace-Hadrill 1987: 226; Pasco-Pranger 2006: 32–34; Scheid 1992 (on the exegetical tradition connected to these calendars and by extension, to Ovid's *Fasti*); and Rüpke 1995b: 408–16.

calendar holds true, *mutatis mutandis*, of the inscribed and painted calendars of the early empire. By the time of Polemius Silvius, however, Christianity had rendered most of the calendar irrelevant, and it had become little more than a unique container for a compendium of antiquarian calendrical lore.

### *Political Use of the Calendar*

At the same time as the calendar was becoming the object of the personal antiquarian interest of the Roman upper classes, contemporary calendars began to be put to public political use, as the *feriae priuatae* (days of private religious observances) of the Julian family were gradually made *feriae publicae* (days of public religious observance) under Caesar and Augustus.<sup>50</sup> We know that in 45 BC the senate established *feriae publicae* on the anniversaries of Caesar's victories and his birthday, and changed the name of the month of Quintilis to Iulius in his honour.<sup>51</sup> In 44 BC Antony even attempted to have his offering of the diadem to Caesar on Lupercalia added to the calendar, though there is no evidence of it in the extant specimens.<sup>52</sup> With a single exception (described below) the earliest 'modern' events recorded on the surviving inscribed calendars date to 49 and 48 BC (Caesar's victories in Spain and at Pharsalus), thus confirming the evidence of the literary sources.<sup>53</sup> Of course Caesar was very interested in the calendar himself and no doubt the senate was encouraged by him in its honorific decrees. Nevertheless, it was Augustus who seems to have taken this infrequent trend and made his actions and those of his family a central part of the Roman calendar and Roman public

<sup>50</sup> See the excellent account of this development in Herbert-Brown 1994: 21–26. See also Zanker 1988: 114, Beard 1987: 9–10, Feeney 2007: 184–89, and Pasco-Pranger 2006: 174–87. See Ovid, *Fasti*, 1. 7–12 for Ovid's comment on this process, with the analysis of Herbert-Brown 1994: 32–214 and Pasco-Pranger 2006: 187–285 for Ovid's handling of it in the *Fasti*.

<sup>51</sup> Cassius Dio 43. 44. 6, 44. 4. 4, 44. 5. 2, 47. 18. 5–6; Appian, *Bella ciuilia*, 2. 106; and Macrobius, *Saturnalia*, 1. 12. 34. The month Sextilis was later changed to Augustus, though a number of other attempts to make similar changes to other months were not successful: see the list in Pasco-Pranger 2006: 116–17, to which should be added the attempt by Commodus to rename every month after himself (Kienast 1996: 148; Cassius Dio 72. 15. 3; and *Historia Augusta*, *Commodus* 11. 8).

<sup>52</sup> Cicero, *Second Philippic*, 87: 'adscribi iussit in fastis ad Lupercalia'. See Feeney 2007: 189 for other examples.

<sup>53</sup> See Feeney 2007: 188–89 for a complete list. The *Fasti Ostienses* are somewhat different: the earliest fragment dates from 49 BC and it records Pompey's departure from Rome that year and his death in Alexandria in 48. It only names Caesar in 46 (his calendar change) and in 44 (his death and bequest to the people). This is because the *Fasti Ostienses* were compiled retrospectively in c. 12 BC and the compiler did not use calendars as his major source.

life.<sup>54</sup> It is not surprising in view of the contemporary interest in the calendar and antiquarianism in general that Caesar and especially Augustus would look to the calendar as a way of presenting a particular image of themselves to the people.<sup>55</sup>

They were not, however, the first of the republican dynasts to have done so. On the contrary, Sulla is the first Roman whom we know to have used the calendar to promote his personal victories. Because his victory on 1 November 82 BC at the battle of the Colline Gate was presented as a victory of Rome over the Samnites, rather than as a personal victory over his opponents who held Rome during civil war, it was retained in the calendar into the early empire.<sup>56</sup> Caesar and the senate were therefore following an earlier practice, whereby the public annual commemoration of a personal victory, rather than one of the state, could be used to enhance power and *auctoritas*. It is a practice that may also have been followed by other *imperatores* of the last century of the republic like Pompey and Crassus, but if they had once been commemorated, the commemorations were abolished by the senate, or by Caesar or Augustus, and thus no trace remains of them.

Augustus quickly saw the value of senatorially decreed annual commemorations of the deeds of Caesar because by 26 October 44 he had converted Caesar's games for Venus Genetrix into games for Caesar himself. The similarity of the content and wording of inscribed calendars (and consularia as we shall see below) in widely

<sup>54</sup> These actions must be seen in light of Augustus's other actions: Millar 1988: 54.

<sup>55</sup> See Rüpke 1995b: 174–86, 396–416; Herbert-Brown 1994; Pasco-Pranger 2002; Pasco-Pranger 2006: 31–53, 176–87 for an overview of the changes made under Augustus and Tiberius; Feeney 2007: 184–89 at p. 185: 'After centuries in which no human being was named on the calendar, the imperial family is now everywhere, with specific year dates often attached to their various doings. Births, deaths, apotheoses, assumptions of power, accessions to priesthoods, comings of age, dedications of temples, victories in battle — the *fasti* of the Roman people take on an increasingly crowded and fussily annotative look'; Feeney 2007: 291–92 n. 84 for a comparison of January in the pre-Julian *Fasti Antiates* and the Augustan *Fasti Praenestini*; and A. Wallace-Hadrill 1987: 223–27 at pp. 226–27: 'Looking back, then, we see Augustus successfully incorporated into three forms of *Fasti*, turning all Roman time into Augustan time. Historically he is the culmination of past magistracies and triumphs; cosmically, he is born on the equinox to bring peace to the world; and in the daily calendar he sits alongside the origins of Rome, when the gods were last close to Roman man.' It must be remembered that before Sulla only three historical events had been commemorated in the calendar (see note 28 above).

<sup>56</sup> See Velleius Paterculus 2. 27. 1, 6, and holidays from 26 October to 1 November in the *Fasti fratrum Arvalium*, *Fasti Sabini*, and *Fasti Maffeiani*, as well as unnamed circuses on 1 November in the *Fasti Oppiani*, *Fasti Antiates ministrorum*, and *Fasti Viae dei Serpenti*. The reference to Sulla himself is later and was only added after 44 BC to distinguish his victory games from those of Caesar. See the calendar commentary in Volume II, 20 July and 26 October.

separated cities demonstrates that from the very beginning of his reign Augustus must have established some kind of 'Office of Public Information'. This will have concerned itself with the proclamation and dissemination in a short, easily digested form of important events concerning the emperor and his family, along with the day and year to which they belonged. These notices were sent to the people of Italy and Sicily at least, and perhaps to the entire empire. This Augustan innovation no doubt grew out of the well-known, but poorly understood system that disseminated the senate's, and later the emperor's, edicts and general laws throughout the empire, along with the names of the annual consuls. We can see this system operating in a much later law of 369 (*CTh*, 8. 11. 3), and there is no reason to think the procedure had changed since the reign of Augustus:

Whenever the joy of auspicious announcements is made known to the provincials and whenever any message is disseminated throughout the world, whether the illustrious victories of Our soldiers and the slaughter of Our enemies and Our triumphs are reported throughout the Empire, or the announcement of those consulships which We either hold Ourselves or bestow on others [...].<sup>57</sup>

The emperor's announcements are likely to have been publicly proclaimed in the Forum or at large public gatherings in a long version and then posted in a short 'headline news' version in a prominent place, like the Forum, and perhaps later in one of the imperial fora, in the way that imperial legislation was later posted in the Forum of Trajan in Rome. Some events required only a single announcement, others required single celebrations, and others of greater importance were to be marked with annual commemoration. Sometimes these categories were confused: some epigraphic calendars include items that were probably not celebrated with annual holidays, particularly the dedication of statues.<sup>58</sup> Copies of these notices

<sup>57</sup> Trans. Pharr 1952: 211. For the *Codex Theodosianus* (*CTh*), see Mommsen and Meyer 1905. See also *CTh*, 8. 11. 1 ('When the beginnings of a year, which must be inaugurated by definite consuls, are announced [...]'), 8. 11. 2 ('Whenever victories are announced, whenever occasions of public rejoicing, or when the names of the new consuls are conveyed throughout the Empire [...]'), 8. 11. 4 ('whenever any of Our auspicious achievements are announced, if wars should cease, if victories should arise, if the honour of the bestowal of royal vestments should be added to the calendar, if the announcement of the tranquillity of peace that has been concluded is to be spread abroad, if by chance We display the sacred imperial countenances to the eager multitudes, such occasions shall be announced'), with Croke 1990b: 190–91, Croke 2001a: 180, and Matthews 2000: 185–99.

<sup>58</sup> The dedications of 8 January and 23 April, entries added later to existing calendars, certainly do not look like items for annual commemoration, though their presence in the calendar implies that they were. Certain other notices for the celebration of victories and dedications do not seem to be for annual commemorations, but one cannot be certain. See the commentary in Volume II.

were sent to other cities and towns for promulgation there as well, so that everyone throughout Italy and perhaps the empire was aware of the actions of the emperor, no matter how mundane the event announced might have been. One assumes that such notices were also posted in a public place in these cities and towns. Those citizens of Italy who had erected inscribed calendars (or their heirs) could add the new imperial notices that required annual commemoration to their already existing calendars if they chose to do so.

This process explains why there are so many verbal similarities among so many widely scattered extant documents.<sup>59</sup> It also explains the divergences among them, especially the various additions one finds under Tiberius: Rome did not send out new 'official' calendars every year or provide a master copy for those in Rome to peruse. Instead, constant notices of imperial activities went out, some mentioning that the event or action was deemed to be of such importance that it was to be commemorated annually in Rome. Individuals then decided for themselves how much (if any) of these regular official notices should be included in their inscribed or manuscript calendars. There was no obligation to do so, and so we may be sure that very few bothered to update their calendars once they had been engraved and erected. Their antiquarian and commemorative purposes were being served whether the texts were kept up to date or not.

This process of proclaiming and disseminating important (and always positive) news about Augustus and his family must have played a significant part in promoting his new role to the Roman people and familiarizing them with it. Much has been made of the 'propaganda' value of imperial poetry, coinage, architecture, and statuary, but the widespread broadcasting of imperial news and the one-time and annual commemoration of imperial victories, anniversaries, and activities would have been far more important for promoting Augustus and his image. So as the calendar and Roman chronology were becoming the objects of antiquarian and historical interest as a window into Rome's past, Caesar and Augustus were simultaneously using the calendar as a means of promoting themselves and their present deeds, and thus linking themselves closely with Rome's glorious republican past and the great shapers of Rome's religious history. In addition, they used it to promote a new universal cult of themselves, which was intended to slowly replace old local ones. These frequent (and in Rome, annual) reminders of continuity from the very foundation of the city to the current regime were particularly important

<sup>59</sup> See 14 and 30 January; 6, 10, 17, and 27 March; 28 April; 4 and 20–30 July; 1, 2, 9, and 18 August; 2, 3, 14, 17, and 23 September; and 12 and 26 October in the calendar translations in Volume II.

because of the momentous changes that Augustus and the Julio-Claudians were introducing into the life of Rome. Citizens, in their turn, could use calendars as a way of declaring support for Rome, for Augustus, and for his new regime, all of which were embodied in this annual account of the victories, ritual actions, and important personal anniversaries of the *princeps* and his family. Furthermore, under Augustus the calendar of Rome began to become a truly Roman calendar as the use of the Julian calendar slowly spread throughout the empire. Indeed in many cities of the Greek East that eventually adopted localized versions of the Julian calendar — in Asia and Crete, and in Smyrna, Bithynia, Paphos, and Ephesus for instance — New Year's day, which normally fell somewhere in the autumn under the old Macedonian calendar, was shifted to Augustus's birthday (23 September), and in Asia and Smyrna the first month was renamed *Kaisarios*.<sup>60</sup> In this way cities and towns could employ the calendar just as we have seen that individuals could. Calendars thus became a medium of reciprocal political and religious statement, from above and from below.

It is in this context that we should view the composition of Ovid's *Fasti*, the most significant commentary on the new Julian calendar. The work as a whole is much easier to understand when viewed within the context of inscribed and painted calendars and the uses to which they were being put under Augustus and Tiberius.<sup>61</sup> It can be no coincidence that Flaccus and Ovid were working on their calendar commentaries at exactly the same time.<sup>62</sup> In a real way, both works represent the pinnacle of the late republican and early imperial antiquarian, religious, and political evolution of the calendar. Other new Roman citizens, newly minted municipal officials, antiquarians, and all those who wished to make clear to their fellow citizens their Romanness and their dedication to the state, no doubt saw the utility of calendars as political vehicles rather than as pragmatic tools, in very much the same way as did Ovid and Flaccus.

<sup>60</sup> Smyrna also had a month named *Tiberios*, and Paphos had four months in a row named *Iulios*, *Kaisarios*, *Sebastos*, and *Autocratikos* (roughly January, February, March, and April) reflecting the Latin names and titles Julius, Caesar, Augustus, and Emperor. For this and the very gradual diffusion of the Julian calendar throughout the empire, see Samuel 1972: 174–88 and Bickerman 1980b: 47–51.

<sup>61</sup> See, for example, Scheid 1992; Herbert-Brown 1994 on the relationship among the calendar, Ovid, and the members of the imperial family; Rüpke 1994; Feeney 1998: 123–27; and A. Wallace-Hadrill 1987.

<sup>62</sup> Herbert-Brown 1994: 26. For Ovid, Augustus, and the calendar, see Herbert-Brown 1994: 60, 119–20 and Pasco-Pranger 2006: 21–72.



But the novelty of the new calendar and the new annual celebrations of the emperor and his family soon wore off: as the antiquarian fervour that had gripped Romans in the late republic and early empire dissipated, and as the interest in reading and writing annalistic and chronographic histories of Rome's early history waned, so did the presentation of inscribed and painted calendars decline and disappear, almost as quickly as the trend had first arisen.<sup>63</sup> In the early first century AD Ovid and Flaccus became the last of a line that extended from Fulvius Nobilior in the early second century BC. As we noted in Chapter 2, chronicles on the model of Nepos and Atticus disappeared at almost exactly the same time as did annalistic history of Rome's past.

In conclusion, then, inscribed and painted calendars were regarded by the Romans themselves primarily as a form of historiography and antiquarianism, a fundamentally Roman way of presenting and representing the past, 'Roman' in this instance meaning 'of the city of Rome'. With the acceptance of new holidays to celebrate the victories and deeds of the *imperatores* and then the emperors, the commemoration of present deeds could be intimately linked within the calendar cycle to the deeds of the gods, the temple dedications of the past, and the three key moments of Rome's past: her foundation, the expulsion of the kings, and the Gallic sack. Populace and emperors could, each in their own way, exploit the calendar for self-promotion and self-representation within a shared and continuous cycle of Roman history.<sup>64</sup>

The consular *fasti* and *consularia* to which we shall now turn our attention should be considered in the light of the above analysis of calendars. Not only did *fasti* and calendars often appear side by side in Rome and in the fora of towns around Rome from the time of Fulvius Nobilior, but *consularia* often contain exactly the same type of information as is found in contemporary calendars, the difference being, of course, that in calendars events are recorded only under the appropriate day of the month, usually without any indication of year, while in *consularia* all events are recorded in chronological order. From the very beginning, then, calendars and *consularia* were related forms of historical commemoration, although *consularia* are closer to what modern readers would regard as a historical genre.

<sup>63</sup> Herbert-Brown, personal communication, suggests that part of the reason may lie in Tiberius's lack of interest in traditional religion and in the lesser interest of the new provincials in the sort of deep Roman past that Augustus had fostered in the aftermath of civil war.

<sup>64</sup> For further important impetus behind the erection of such inscriptions, see Corbier 2006: 9–75, with pp. 29–32 specifically on *fasti* and calendars.

## Epigraphic Fasti and Consularia in the Early Roman Empire

As surprising as it may seem to us today, an interest in compiling and maintaining accurate lists of non-contemporary consuls did not appear among the Romans until the second century BC, and the complete list of consuls from 509 BC as we now accept it is in fact a product of the very early empire. When an interest in having a complete consular list did develop, it was not for administrative, legal, or commercial reasons, but rather for antiquarian and historiographical ones, as we saw in our discussion of M. Fulvius Nobilior. As the calendar became an object of antiquarian attention, so too did the consular fasti, since they were naturally regarded as a part of the calendar. The Fasti Praenestini, the combination of calendar, calendar commentary, and fasti that M. Verrius Flaccus compiled to stand behind his statue in the forum at Praeneste, is a perfect example of the antiquarian interests that lay behind the production of these inscribed lists. As we noted earlier, M. Fulvius Nobilior seems to have been the first to research and compile a complete list of consuls and censors, a list that formed the chronological basis for Q. Ennius's epic fifteen-book *Annales*, though it must be noted that modern scholarship is quite divided on the controversial issue of the origins of the earliest consular fasti and this is simply one interpretation of the evidence.

This first basic list (regardless of who compiled it) will have been used by the earliest prose historians as the basis of their own chronologies as they undertook further research into Rome's early history. As we shall demonstrate in Volume II, the differences among the surviving fasti of the republic and the comments made by Livy about the confusion in the fasti presented by earlier historians amply attest to the absence of a standardized list covering the period before about 300 BC that they could rely upon and consult. That is probably the earliest date from which Fulvius (and also the earliest Roman historians, writing immediately before and after him) could compile fasti on the basis of contemporary and near-contemporary sources. From that point forward, contemporary compilation by successive generations of historians ensured that the record was accurate and consistent, and no one made any attempt to 'correct' that list. Before that date, however, the list was a result of historical research; therefore, further research (or claimed, feigned, research) could produce variant consuls and new consular pairs. Just as was the case with calendars, the differences among the various surviving lists of republican consuls demonstrate the lack of any official master copy or of archives available to historians or antiquarians for consultation and research.<sup>65</sup> Nevertheless, textual criticism

<sup>65</sup> For the lack of central Roman government archives, see Rawson 1985: 238–39.

demonstrates that the surviving lists do ultimately depend upon a single, early compilation, which most historians used, though only the earliest at first or second hand.<sup>66</sup> That single compilation was no doubt the list of Fulvius Nobilior (if we accept that he in fact compiled such a text) and the 'excerpts' from it in Ennius's *Annales*. However, once it had made its way into general circulation, the original was ignored or lost (particularly easy if it was no more than a painted list), and its descendants were either multigenerational copies of it (i.e. plain *fasti*) and/or the consular pairs which formed the backbone of later, multi-volume annalistic histories. In either case, copyists' errors and attempts to correct the list on the basis of further research would have caused changes, both subtle and not so subtle. Either no one could or no one bothered to go back to the original list, and the work of one's immediate predecessors provided everything that was necessary. We can see exactly this process of corruption and 'correction' by tracing the history of the imperial 'Fasti of 161' through the many later texts that used it: virtually every text presents a list that differs from related texts, and all are quite distinct from the list of consuls whom we know, on the basis of other evidence, to have actually been proclaimed and disseminated. Indeed, the evidence we have for the *fasti* of the imperial period presents the same picture as we have outlined for the last two centuries of the republic: no 'official' or authoritative list of consuls, compiled by order of the senate, emperor, or local decurions, was available for interested individuals to examine or check. A single basic list, privately compiled and then used only from its corrupt progeny, served everyone's needs.<sup>67</sup> The historical and antiquarian purpose of these private works of compilation is fundamental for understanding their nature.

Unfortunately, apart from this important parallel evidence from the empire, there is little explicit data from the republic for the existence of written *fasti* circulating separately from histories.<sup>68</sup> We do, however, have abundant evidence for inscribed *fasti* and consularia in the late republic and early empire. The earliest surviving examples of these are the *Fasti Antiates maiores* of 67/55 BC (painted), the *Fasti Capitolini*, and the related, though non-consular, *Acta triumphorum Capitolina* of c. 18 BC, all described below.

<sup>66</sup> This will be demonstrated in Volume II.

<sup>67</sup> See Burgess 2000.

<sup>68</sup> Wiseman 1979: 14: 'For Cicero, Horace and Livy, at any rate, consular *fasti* were books to be looked through, not an inscribed document to be consulted' (citing Cicero, *Ep. ad Atticum*, 4. 8a. 2; Livy 9. 18. 12; and Horace, *Satires*, 1. 3. 112). On the other hand, it should be noted that Macrobius (*Saturnalia*, 1. 12. 30), though quite some time later, does cite two inscribed/painted *fasti*, at Aricia and Praeneste.

Now Attilio Degrassi, the editor of the corpus of inscribed fasti, divides these fasti texts into two groups, those erected 'officially' by municipal governments ('fasti municipales', his nos 4–16) and other private lists erected by religious colleges, guilds, private associations, and private individuals ('fasti collegiorum et priuatorum hominum', nos 17–34).<sup>69</sup> But in spite of Degrassi's classification, there is no evidence that 'municipal fasti' were ever compiled or maintained 'officially', that is, by the *duoviri* or decurions of their *municipia*, any more than there is evidence for officially erected or maintained calendars. By contrast, such officials clearly did take responsibility for the publication, on bronze, marble, or painted wood, of official laws and proclamations, as we saw in the case of the bronze municipal charters from Spain.<sup>70</sup> Inscribed fasti would, of course, have coexisted physically with the large number of officially sponsored publications that cluttered the public areas of Roman municipalities, but there is no evidence that municipal governments ever took an interest in promoting the sort of Roman history and antiquarianism that such fasti represent. Nor did other semi-official bodies like priestly collegia take an interest in these sorts of antiquarianism, not even in Ostia, for which extraordinary claims have sometimes been made, as we shall see below.

Given the close contextual relationships between calendars and fasti, it makes good sense to posit that, as with calendars, the men who erected and maintained epigraphic fasti had an antiquarian or historical interest in the Roman past, and that they wished in some way to extol the recent and contemporary acts of the emperor and his family, and to be publicly associated with them, through the act of putting up a public, chronographic monument. Again as with calendars, the importance of epigraphic fasti and consularia almost certainly lay in the very Romanness of the consular system. Such a list, erected in a forum by a wealthy benefactor (or guild or community association), was an obvious way of declaring one's Romanness and wealth. Such inscriptions served to demonstrate obvious and public support for the

<sup>69</sup> As for the differences between these two types of fasti, Degrassi's comments justifying his placing of the Fasti Antiates minores in the latter category instead of the former are very telling: 'Hos fastos, qui sola nomina consulum exhibeant, etiam inter municipales referre possis [...]. Sed tanti errores in iis insunt, ut potius collegio vel homini cuidam priuato adscribendi esse uideantur' (Degrassi 1947: 303), which is to say that Degrassi would have thought the Fasti Antiates minores 'official' fasti, except for the fact that they are filled with egregious errors, which suggests a private origin and disqualifies them from being official. For Degrassi, then, the difference between 'official' and 'private' fasti cannot depend upon any concrete or observable feature or style other than 'accuracy' — which is to say their conformity to modern deductions about the actual date of events.

<sup>70</sup> See pp. 147–48, above. Not a single one of these 'official' documents is a calendar or fasti.

emperor and the imperial city, on the part of both the individual who erected the monument and also his *patria*. In a very real way it was an exact reflection of what Augustus himself had done in such places as the Forum Romanum next to the Temple of Caesar and his new Forum Augustum (see below).

This purpose is especially obvious with those fasti that began their compilation with dates of political significance, especially the Social War, when all (freeborn adult male) Italians were granted full Roman citizenship, or the first arrival in Italy of Octavian (i.e. 43 BC). Similarly, in Ostia it looks as though the local consularia began with the date at which the city's new constitution was granted, that is, when it first elected *duoviri*, the municipal version of the consuls. And it may be that the first panel was erected on the occasion of the taking of the office of pontifex maximus by Augustus. But whatever motives we ascribe to those who paid for and erected these inscriptions, it is fundamental for our understanding of them that they be seen in the same context as epigraphic calendars, the Parian Marble and the *Chronicon Romanum*, and all other known historical inscriptions: not as attempts by local or central governments to provide their populations with practical administrative or educational tools, but as private initiatives of a fundamentally antiquarian or political nature (or religious in the case of the Lindian chronicle; see Chapter 2, note 84).

### *The Fasti Antiates maiores*

The oldest surviving inscribed calendar and fasti is the Fasti Antiates maiores.<sup>71</sup> It seems originally to have been a continuation of the calendar and fasti of the *aedes Herculis Musarum*, whose construction by Fulvius Nobilior we considered above. As such, the Fasti Antiates once extended from c. 173 to 67/55 BC, although it is extant only for the years between 164 and 84, with some gaps. While the calendar of the Fasti Antiates contains references to the usual annually commemorated historical events — the foundation of Rome, the expulsion of the kings, and the defeat at the River Allia — the fasti do not refer to any historical events. They do, however, note suffect consuls in 162, 154, and 130 BC; name the censors and state that they performed the *lustrum*; twice note when the censors abdicated and did not perform the *lustrum* (109 and 92); and place a theta next to the names of consuls

<sup>71</sup> Fasti: Degrassi 1947: 160–65, and calendar: Degrassi 1963: 2–27. The fragments of the calendar and fasti were found in 1915 in the remains of a bedroom in a seaside villa at Anzio (Antium: BA, 43.F4, 44.C3), and these fragile and much faded fragments are now housed in the Museo nazionale romano a Palazzo Massimo alle Terme in Rome. It is clearly, therefore, not an 'official' document, let alone even a public document.

who died in office (154, 103, 90, 89).<sup>72</sup> They also include many examples of individual consuls' filiation (mostly between 107 and 84, though one as early as 161) and in four surviving places include the father's filiation as well (146, 121, 120, 115). In generic terms, then, they are lightly expanded pure fasti, not yet consularia. Nevertheless, their contents are rather more than one would expect from a pragmatic chronological aide-memoire; they clearly express an antiquarian interest in the consuls and censors of the recent past, as we would expect from a project that derived its inspiration from the work of Fulvius. Their location, in a private villa, also demonstrates that they were not in any way official.

### *The Fasti Capitolini and the Acta triumphorum Capitolina*

The most important and well known of the extant inscribed fasti are the Fasti Capitolini, so called from the fact that they have always been kept in the Capitoline Museum in Rome. The Fasti Capitolini lie within the tradition of lightly expanded epigraphic fasti exemplified by the earlier Fasti Antiates maiores, but their historical entries mark a generic shift towards consularia. Erected in 18/17 BC in the Roman Forum, the Fasti Capitolini were inscribed on the interior faces of the two outer arches of the triple arch that Augustus erected next to the temple of Caesar to commemorate his Parthian 'victory'.<sup>73</sup> The fasti inscribed there listed all consuls, military tribunes with consular power, dictators, *magistri equitum*, and censors from the foundation of the republic in 509 BC to AD 13. Such a document, in such a place and on such a monument, might be assumed to be a copy in stone of the 'official and authoritative record' of the highest state officials of the republic, preserved by the senate or the pontifex maximus; since the text was first discovered, virtually all modern scholars have assumed as much, explicitly or implicitly, which is why the consular list of the Fasti Capitolini became the standard version of the consular fasti that we still follow to this day (supplemented, where necessary, from the closely related fasti in the *Chronograph of 354*).<sup>74</sup>

<sup>72</sup> All censorial notices in the Fasti Antiates are painted in red. The theta comes from θάνατος, 'death', and is used here and in gladiatorial depictions to mean ἐπέθανε, 'he died'. See Persius, *Satires*, 4. 13 and Martial, *Epigrams*, 7. 37. 2.

<sup>73</sup> See *CAH*, 72, 90, 160. We describe this inscription and the controversies surrounding its origins and location in detail in Volume II.

<sup>74</sup> This is also why so many scholars of the past and present (most recently Simpson 1993) insist that the inscription must have adorned the walls of the Regia, the house of the pontifex maximus and supposed home of the ancient *Annales maximi* (on which, see Volume II), which is claimed as the source of the fasti. As recently as 2007 Karl-Ludwig Elvers could still claim that the

Unfortunately, however, the *Fasti Capitolini* is not an official list at all; it is, in fact, no less a product of historical research than the *fasti* of Fulvius Nobilior and Verrius Flaccus, or the histories, chronicles, and epigraphic *fasti* produced in the last decades of the republic and under the Julio-Claudians.<sup>75</sup> Along with the associated *Acta triumphorum Capitolina*, it presents a very specific historical vision of the republic: listing both the chief republican magistrates and also the years in which the most famous Roman wars against foreign enemies had begun, it presents a version of Roman history as Roman triumph. Although this alone is enough to suggest a historical interest to stand alongside any practical one, the historical or antiquarian aspects of the *Fasti Capitolini* are made clear from other indications as well. Degrassi noted, for instance, that there is a space of fifteen or sixteen lines above the first consuls of 509 BC that must have been taken up with a title of two or three lines and then a summary account of Rome's history during the Regal period.<sup>76</sup> Similarly, although the consuls were the fundamental Roman dating system, the *Fasti Capitolini* adds years *ab urbe condita* to its consular list. The AUC chronology is calculated from the foundation of Rome, not just the creation of the consuls 243 years later, and can have been of purely historical, not practical interest.<sup>77</sup>

*Fasti Capitolini* contained 'the official list of magistrates that was drawn up under Augustus' (in Eder and Renger 2007: 195).

<sup>75</sup> For this, see Taylor 1951, A. Wallace-Hadrill 1987: 223–24, Rüpke 1995a, Rüpke 1997, and Feeney 2007: 172–83. The most obvious clue to their fabrication is the appearance of the four fictitious Varronian dictator years (see note 7 above), which prove beyond a doubt that this text is an antiquarian reconstruction, no less so than the list of Livy or the *Descriptio consulum* (whose *fasti* do not contain these dictator years; for the details, see Volume II). Luce 1990: 136 and A. Wallace-Hadrill 1987: 224 acknowledge the importance of Augustus himself to the project of producing these *fasti*. Atticus's *Liber annalis* is likely to have been the basic source for the *Fasti* (though see note 77 below), since the dictator years seem to have been the invention of Atticus and Octavian had been his close friend and shared his antiquarian interests: Cornelius Nepos, *Vita T. Pomponii Attici*, 19.2–20.3, and the commentary of Horsfall 1989: 103–06. The use of years AUC for the consular *fasti* and the triumphal *acta* would also seem to derive from Atticus, since there is no other evidence for its regular use in contemporary historiography: see the reconstruction of the *Liber annalis* in Volume II (for the use of AUC dates by the earliest Roman historians, see note 5 above and 'Chapter 4, note 6' in the Appendices to the Footnotes, pp. 371–73 below).

<sup>76</sup> Degrassi 1947: 80 suggested, speculatively but plausibly, that this account would have included the founding of the city by Romulus, the *interregnum*, the names of the seven kings, the four *lustra* performed by Servius Tullius (because censorial *lustra* are so important later in the list), the expulsion of the kings, and the election of the first consuls.

<sup>77</sup> See Feeney 2007: 174–76. However, since the Varronian system attributed 244 years to the Regal period, the *Fasti Capitolini* must have placed the foundation of Rome in 752 BC not

Moreover, the *Fasti Capitolini* set the foundation of Rome in 752 BC, but as was noted above the standard date for the foundation from the time of Atticus and Varro was 753 BC. That eccentric dating is one more argument against the official status of the *Fasti*, as is the fact that *acta triumphorum* were set up on two panels on either side of the consular lists. Degrassi inaccurately labelled these texts *Fasti triumphales Capitolini*, but they are not *fasti* according to any definition of the word.<sup>78</sup> This *Acta triumphorum* lists the names of all Roman kings, dictators, consuls, proconsuls, and propraetors who had celebrated triumphs and ovations going back to the very year of the city's foundation. Even more than the consular *fasti*, the *Acta triumphorum* is a document of solely antiquarian and historical interest. Though it had real political importance to Augustan ideology, it lacks even the slightest chronological or administrative relevance. Each entry in the *Acta* provides the triumphator's full name with filiation, his office, and the year AUC, followed by the name of the king or people conquered or the province in which the victorious battle took place. The antiquarian aspects are transparent. Indeed, had the *Fasti Capitolini* and *Acta triumphorum Capitolina* been preserved in a manuscript rather than on stone, they would now be treated as the valuable works of historical research that they are, and no one would entertain the idea of their being 'official' lists.

It is true that the *Fasti* and *Acta* were mounted by Augustus on his arch in the very heart of the Forum, an arch that was dedicated to the return of the standards from Parthia and erected next to the Temple of the Divine Julius. They were, in

Varronian 753 (see 'Chapter 4, note 6' in the Appendices to the Footnotes, p. 371 below). The first surviving AUC date preserved in the *Fasti Capitolini* is AUC 290, assigned to the consuls of 463 BC, which implies a date of 752 BC for the foundation of the city. The first surviving republican AUC date we have in the associated *Acta triumphorum Capitolina* is AUC 250, assigned to the consul of 503 BC, which indicates the same date. Since the consular list is the correct length from 509 BC (as we can tell from the later AUC dates), the AUC dates must have been obtained by reducing the Regal period from 244 years (as in Livy 1. 60. 3 and Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Antiquitates Romanae*, 1. 75. 1 and 3, for instance) to 243 years (as in a now-lost, fourth-century epitome of Livy, witnessed by later writers: Eutropius, *Breviarium*, 1. 8. 3; Festus 2. 1; Jerome, *Chron. can.*, 106). Atticus's date for the foundation was 753 BC not 752 (see 'Chapter 4, note 6' in the Appendices to the Footnotes, p. 371 below). The change to 752 BC therefore means that the Capitoline list reflects a modification of Atticus's list rather than a direct copy of his *Liber annalis*. See Werner 1963: 192–209. Forsythe 2005: 369 is incorrect in attributing a date of 753 BC to the two Capitoline texts.

<sup>78</sup> See Feeney 2007: 167–68, and 285 n. 2. We here revert to Mommsen's more accurate title, *Acta triumphorum*.



other words, put up under official sponsorship; as official as sponsorship could be in the last two decades BC. But does that fact make the lists they contain official in any practical sense? Need we imagine Augustus putting up his *Fasti* and *Acta* so that Roman businessmen could calculate the date of old documents, or so that curious citizens would know who had been consul in the 367th year of the city? While both texts could, of course, serve that function incidentally, their importance, and their purpose, was clearly otherwise: Augustus had them erected because, taken as a whole and in the place where they stood, they conveyed an important narrative, both historical and political: 'an antiquarian interest in the Roman past could be put to use in the propaganda of the newly-established dynasty, and immortalized in stone in the monuments which it put up in the centre of Rome'.<sup>79</sup>

The texts of Augustus's Parthian arch are, in other words, analogous to the 'hall of fame' in the Forum Augustum of 2 BC, with its statues of illustrious Romans bearing short *elogia* carved into their bases forming a kind of three-dimensional chronicle that placed Augustus and Caesar at the culmination of Roman history.<sup>80</sup> The antiquarianism that had flourished at the end of the republic was now serving the ends of imperial self-representation. On the Parthian arch, the *populus Romanus* could see that Augustus was a part of the regular republican continuum leading right back to Brutus and Collatinus. The consuls still served, the *triumphatores* — the first of whom, Romulus, was listed in the very first year of the city — still passed through the Forum.<sup>81</sup> In spite of all the changes he wrought on the fabric of Roman life, and whether or not these were visible to contemporaries, Augustus wished to portray himself as a leader dedicated to, and still a part of, the republican past, still living within its traditions.<sup>82</sup> The *Fasti Capitolini* thus represents an earlier, implicit adumbration of the claim to republican continuities that he would

<sup>79</sup> Millar 1988: 54.

<sup>80</sup> See Geiger 2008 in particular for these statues and their *elogia*, as well as Luce 1990: 123: 'Augustus' forum, dedicated in 2 B.C., expresses forcibly how the emperor wanted his countrymen to view the sweep of Roman history and his place in it.' The Parthian arch is an earlier attempt at the same goal.

<sup>81</sup> Though it is important to note that the most recent *triumphator* noted, L. Cornelius Balbus, of 19 BC, the 734th year of the city, was carefully and intentionally placed right at the bottom of the last panel with no further spaces left available. The message was clear: the non-imperial triumph was no more and the *acta* erected by Augustus were its final and formal epitaph. See A. Wallace-Hadrill 1987: 224 and Beard 2004: 117.

<sup>82</sup> See Eder 1990: 86–87, and 118–20, esp. p. 86: 'Augustus was concerned to the very end of his life to place himself in the tradition of the Republic'. See also Rich 1998: 114–15, 125–28.

make explicit in his *Res gestae*, a text likewise designed for monumental display on the wall of a public building, in that case, his tomb. The Fasti reaffirmed his dedication to the *mos maiorum* and implicitly contradicted any suspicions of *res nouae*. Roman history, Roman republican history, had not ended. On the contrary, it continued through him and his father, the *Diuus*, as Caesar is named throughout the Fasti. Augustus, in this telling, sits at the pinnacle of republican achievement.<sup>83</sup> The tremendous historical detail of the Fasti Capitolini was not essential for conveying this narrative. It was, instead, a by-product of its antiquarian origins and probably of Augustus's own antiquarian interests: as Elizabeth Rawson said, the 'Augustan restoration is inconceivable' without the antiquarianism of men like Varro.<sup>84</sup>

The later extension of the Fasti Capitolini down to AD 13 reveals more clearly the realities of power that lay behind the republican ideology of Augustus's reign. An annual reference to the renewed tribunician power of Augustus had followed the names of the consuls in the Fasti from 22 BC. In the later extension, the renewal of Augustus's *tribunicia potestas*, and that of Tiberius from AD 5, replaces the consular names as the main designation of the year. The markers of tribunician authority thus take on the characteristics of a Hellenistic regnal year: by the end of Augustus's reign it had become less important to maintain the republican facade.<sup>85</sup> The use of tribunician power as a form of dating was an unrepeatable experiment, one that did not survive the reign of Augustus, not least because it robbed the consulship of all its value and was therefore contrary to the interests of the entire

<sup>83</sup> Millar 1988: 49–51 at p. 49: 'The history of Republican Rome was thus formally re-emphasized just at the moment when it was becoming, in a certain sense, irrelevant.' For the general background, see Zanker 1988: 89–98, 167–263, esp. p. 203, a discussion of the *Acta triumphorum* that — in a fashion quite typical of the scholarship on this question — misses the importance of the consular fasti, describing them merely as 'the official reckoning of the *fasti*'. An important analysis of Augustus, his view of Roman history, and the historical statues in the Forum Augustum can be found in Geiger 2008: 25–115, esp. pp. 63–91.

<sup>84</sup> Rawson 1985: 246. See also Feeney 2007: 64–65 for republican antiquarianism as a prefiguration of imperial universalism.

<sup>85</sup> See Feeney 2007: 180–81. In the same way that the list of *triumphatores* signalled the end of the Roman triumph in its republican form — henceforth only the emperor and his family could triumph — it is possible that Augustus may have originally planned for his consular list to mark the end of the consulship as a dating system. After all, he had certainly absorbed all the important powers of that office into his own position, so that little remained to the consuls themselves beyond the obligation to provide annual games and their incidental function in giving their names to the year. It may be that Augustus's experiment with tribunician power foreshadowed a plan to arrogate the eponymy of the annual consuls to himself.

senatorial order.<sup>86</sup> In a way, moreover, it emphasized too baldly that the consuls had become a mere relic of the past. Augustus's inscribed consularia had therefore lost their ongoing ideological significance: by AD 13, the purpose of the *Fasti Capitolini* was accomplished, and that is why it was never continued.<sup>87</sup>

*Other Julio-Claudian Consularia and Acta Triumphorum*

Although the *Fasti Capitolini* has become the paradigmatic example of the genre in most scholarly discussions, Augustus was not the only one interested in detailed lists of the consuls: Degrassi published the texts of twenty-three other epigraphic *fasti* and consularia, and the fragments of five more have come to light since his original publication. All are described in detail in Volume II, but we here include some comments on their general historical significance. Included among Degrassi's *fasti* are five examples of inscribed consularia and proto-consularia (perhaps a better term for works with such limited historical annotation), though he does not so designate them or segregate them from the other *fasti*: the *Fasti Ostienses*, from Ostia, inscribed for the first time perhaps around 12 BC with surviving fragments between 49 BC and AD 175 (Degrassi no. 5), and the only true, fully developed set of epigraphic consularia extant; the *Fasti Venusini*, from Venusia, inscribed between 16 BC and AD 4 with surviving fragments between 35 and 28 BC (no. 8); the *Fasti Amiternini*, from Amiternum, inscribed between 26 May AD 17 and November AD 19 with surviving fragments between 63 and 28 BC (no. 4); the *Fasti Cuprenses*, from Cupra Maritima, inscribed at an unknown date with surviving fragments between 47 BC and AD 14 (no. 7); and the *Fasti Gabini*, from Gabii, inscribed at an unknown date with surviving fragments between 27 and 22 BC and AD 2 and 6 (no. 9).<sup>88</sup> Since Degrassi's publication, fragments of one other example

<sup>86</sup> It was unsuccessfully proposed again by M. Silanus in 22 (see note 9 above).

<sup>87</sup> Feeney 2007: 182: 'With his redefinition and appropriation of the Romans' eponymous lists, past triumphs, and past *Ludi Saeculares*, Augustus over the years created a profound reconfiguration of the systems of representing the past time of the city. This reconfiguration centered on his own person and that of his heir, in the process forging links with Rome's divine origins and creating a new imperial dating era. The Republican time systems appear to be still in place, but by the end of Augustus' reign their symbolic power, iconography, and resonance have been compromised and redrawn.'

<sup>88</sup> Degrassi 1947: 170–71 (Ostia: *BA*, 43.B2), 173–241 (Venusia: *BA*, 45.C3), 244–46 (Amiternum: *BA*, 42.E4), 254–55 (Cupra Maritima: *BA*, 42.F2), and 257–58 (Gabii: *BA*, 43.C2, 44.C2). The *Fasti Ostienses* were also published in an improved version by Vidman 1982: 40–53.

of consularia have surfaced, the *Fasti Tauromenitani* (39–34 and 30–28 BC), from Tauromenium in Sicily.<sup>89</sup>

The *Fasti Amiternini* and *Fasti Venusini* are similar to the *Fasti Capitolini* in the way they note famous wars and battles (and one *lustrum* conducted in 28 BC by Augustus and Agrippa as censors), though the *Fasti Amiternini* also notes the enemy against whom Roman wars were fought. In the *Fasti Amiternini* the historical entries are more than twice the size of the letters used for the consuls and other notices in the text, and in the *Venusini* they are of the same large size as the consuls' names. The *Fasti Amiternini* also mirrors the *Capitolini* in listing its historical entries *before* the relevant consuls, instead of after them, as is otherwise always the case in such inscriptions.<sup>90</sup> These proto-consularia are all translated in Volume II. The *Fasti Cuprenses* likewise enlarges the letters of the battle entries for the Alexandrian War and the battle of Actium, but the remainder of its detailed historical entries remain the same size as the consular names. It is obvious that its author used a text like the *Amiternini* as his main source, but added further historical entries to it. The more recently discovered *Fasti Tauromenitani* is also of this type, though only one partial word survives from a single historical entry from 30 BC ('] confecta', 'concluded'). These five consularia therefore establish an early 'type' for this sort of document, which clearly derived from earlier exemplars like the *Fasti Capitolini*.

The historical and antiquarian focus of these texts is clear, but it is worth underscoring their political and ideological significance in the present context. The *Fasti Amiternini* and *Venusini*, and perhaps the *Cuprenses* too, began their consular lists with the Social War in 90 BC, explicitly designated as the starting point of the consularia in the heading of the *Fasti Venusini* ('[Be]lla facta a bello Mar-sico'; 'Wars fought since the Social War').<sup>91</sup> This date was almost certainly chosen because, as a result of this war, the Senate granted full citizenship to all adult free-born male Italians. This historical heading is of great significance for our interpretations. Along with the enlarged letters of the 'war' entries, it shows that the inscription was important not so much for its consular record as for the dates of the wars it recorded. This again underlines the fact that these were historical and antiquarian, not administrative, documents.

<sup>89</sup> Ruck 1996. *Tauromenium*: BA, 47.G3.

<sup>90</sup> This no doubt explains why the *Fasti Cuprenses* dates the battle of Actium to 32 BC: its compiler did not understand how his source marked such events (Degrassi 1947: 245).

<sup>91</sup> Degrassi 1947: 254–55. This also appears to have stood at the head of another very fragmentary fasti text, the *Fasti Caeretani*, published with the calendars (Degrassi 1963: 64): '[a bello Ma]rsico'. In the light of the very fragmentary nature of this text, we have not included it in our discussion here.

The title of one other set of *fasti* survives, the *Fasti magistrorum uici*. These were found in Rome and contain a calendar, *fasti*, and a dated list of religious magistrates of that particular district, the *magistri uici*. Two titles survive for these texts. The first, like the title of the *Fasti Venusini*, explains the inception date for the consular list, in this case 43 BC: ‘Consules censores ab Imperatore Caesare pontifice maximo’ (‘Consuls and censors from [the arrival of] Emperor Caesar Pontifex Maximus’); the second explains the inception date of 7 BC for the list of *magistri*: ‘Imperator Caesar Augustus Pontifex Maximus consul XI tribunicia potestate XVII Lares Augustos magistris uici dedit’ (‘Imperator Caesar Augustus, Pontifex Maximus, consul eleven times, in the seventeenth year of his tribunician power [= 7–6 BC] bestowed the Imperial Lares upon the *magistri* of the *uicus*’).<sup>92</sup> These titles make explicit the close ideological connection among calendars, *fasti*, and the person of Augustus, especially in his role as pontifex maximus.

Although inscribed *acta triumphorum* are rarer than their counterparts, two such *acta* survive apart from the Capitolina, which was discussed above. The *Acta triumphorum Urbisalviensia* and *Barberiniana* both fit the model described in some detail above for the Capitolina, and the *Urbisalviensia* was also, like the Capitolina, accompanied by *fasti consulares*.<sup>93</sup> Both the *Urbisalviensia* and the *Barberiniana* are very similar in form and wording to the Capitolina, though they all differ from one another in various minor respects, so it would seem that all three shared a common ancestral triumphal list. The *Barberiniana* is the oldest of the three inscriptions, probably completed in 21 BC, which proves that the Capitolina cannot be its source. The ultimate source of all three was probably a written text, with each of the engravers working from a slightly different apograph.<sup>94</sup> All three *acta* are described in detail in Volume II.

<sup>92</sup> The *fasti* conclude in 2 BC, though they were later extended to AD 3, and while the list of *magistri* ends in AD 2/3, later *magistri* were added in AD 5/6, 14, 18, and 21. It is, of course, true that Augustus’s name was Octavian not Emperor Caesar when he made his first big appearance in Italy in 43 BC, and he did not become pontifex maximus until 12 BC, but these were his names and titles at the time the list was erected. The important connection between the office of pontifex maximus and the calendar was made especially clear when Augustus corrected the calendar in 9 BC (he stopped what had been the too-frequent addition of leap days) only having taken over the office of pontifex from Lepidus in 12 BC. For it was only as pontifex maximus that he could fix the calendar. The importance of the censors in this list should also be emphasized, as we have already seen in the case of the *Fasti Capitolini*.

<sup>93</sup> Degraffi 1947: 338–45 and Paci 1981 = *AE*: 240–41.

<sup>94</sup> A similar hypothesis has been postulated to account for the differences among the Persian, Parthian, and Greek texts of the great stone-cut inscription of Shapur I: Huyse 2006.

### *The Fasti Ostienses*

The local consularia of Ostia, the *Fasti Ostienses*, are in quite a different category from the other inscribed proto-consularia that we have seen so far. They were first inscribed around 12 BC, on a single plaque of marble about two metres high, though we have no idea where in the city it was erected (fragments of the entire inscription have been found in two separate areas of the city). The text probably began with the year of Ostia's new constitution, during the Sullan period, and was eventually continued at least as far as AD 178. For every year it included ordinary and suffect consuls and local *duoviri* (the local mayors). Where the dedicators felt it appropriate, it also included a variety of disparate historical entries concerning the emperor, Rome, and a few local events. From its beginning around 12 BC the work was continued over the next 190 years and eventually covered eighteen plaques, extending for almost twelve metres. The early historical entries — of which only those from 49–44 BC survive — lack day dates, no doubt because they were compiled retrospectively from a chronicle or history; otherwise, however, historical entries are written out in the standard style that we see in consularia of the same period and later.

It has been claimed that the *Fasti Ostienses* was officially established and maintained not by the local curia but by the chief priest of Vulcan, the *pontifex Volcani*.<sup>95</sup> This conclusion arises from the references in the *Fasti* to the death and/or election of the pontifex (AD 30, 36, 93?, 105), to actions by his aediles (AD 91), and to the rebuilding of his temple (AD 112), as well as from the fact that the inscription was maintained continuously for almost two hundred years, a unique instance that implies some kind of corporate oversight. Yet the local *duoviri* are also named at the end of each year's entry with notes in the years when they had censorial powers, as are a year when they were not elected (49 BC), a year when a *duovir* died and was replaced (AD 30), and four years when prefects were appointed to undertake a *duovir*'s duties, either because of his death or because the *duovir* was either Agrippa Postumus or the emperor (AD 6, 36, 106, 126). Local events are also occasionally mentioned, often those involving local aristocrats and their munificence.<sup>96</sup>

<sup>95</sup> Most recently, Vidman 1982: 147–48 ('Fastos Ostienses pontifici Volcani et aedium sacrum curae fuisse [...] nunc omnibus probatur'); Bargagli and Grosso 1997: 12–13. Meiggs 1973: 172 calls the *Fasti Ostienses* 'the town's official record'.

<sup>96</sup> See, e.g., AD 2 (funeral for Lucius), 94 (munificence: crypt), 115 (fire), 127 (munificence: Temple of Serapis), 140 (munificence: statue), 146 (munificence: games and statue), and 152 (munificence: basilica, games, and statues).

That is to say, references to local events, officials, and aristocrats are not unusual in this document, and the *pontifices Volcani* are by no means uniquely prominent. Furthermore, it seems to have gone unnoticed that Vulcan was the ancient *patrius deus* of Ostia and the *pontifex Volcani* oversaw all religious activity within the city, even 'foreign cults' like those dedicated to Isis, Magna Mater, and Serapis. His position was held for life, and it was the highest municipal office to which anyone could aspire, surpassing in status even the duovirate and censorship.<sup>97</sup> In light of this, it is clear that references to the *pontifex* are no more than a reflection of his enormous importance to the civic life of Ostia. Although the Fasti Ostienses provides no explicit evidence as to who first erected it or who thereafter maintained it for 190 years, the historical entries imply that it was a private inscription erected by local aristocrats to celebrate themselves and Ostia's close connection with Rome and the emperor.<sup>98</sup>

### *Consularia in the High Empire*

Apart from the Fasti Tauromenitani from Sicily, no fasti or consularia have been found outside Italy. Like the calendars, most inscribed fasti and consularia are clustered around Rome and its environs. In addition, of all the fasti and consularia mentioned above and described in detail in Volume II, only six are later than the Julio-Claudian period: the Fasti Interamnates survives as far as AD 75, the Fasti Potentienses as far as 116, the Tivoli fragments as far as 121, the Fasti Ostienses as far as 175, and the only surviving single fragments of the Fasti Palatini and the Fasti Caleni cover the years 209–12 and 288–89, respectively. Although they do not do so in large numbers, the late survival of the genre of inscribed fasti is significant and quite different from the fate of inscribed calendars, which we discussed above. There is no positive evidence to explain why fasti should have survived longer as a

<sup>97</sup> See Meiggs 1973: 173, 177–78, 205, 337–43.

<sup>98</sup> We suspect that these Fasti may indeed have been first erected by a *pontifex Volcani*, who had close ties to Rome and Augustus, and that he ended the original plaque with the notice of Augustus's proclamation as pontifex maximus in 12 BC and his own election. It would thus have been an act of aristocratic self-aggrandizement, not official record-keeping. Each of the later pontifices would then have continued the text down to his own election, simply as a way of keeping up appearances. No doubt each local noble who was singled out on the inscription for embellishing the city 'sua pecunia' ('out of his own pockets') was a friend or ally of the sponsoring pontifex. Eventually one pontifex failed to complete his section and the tradition ceased. Certainly the expense involved in erecting an inscription of this size and quality would have been restricted to the very highest level of society, and the 190-year tradition of engraving suggests that aristocratic competition lay at the root of its surprising continuity.

genre than did calendars, but we suspect that it was largely a matter of the labour involved. The complexity and expense of producing calendars led to their early demise, while fasti were easier to compile and reproduce on stone.

### Conclusions

The interest in Roman history that produced calendars (with and without commentaries), fasti, *acta triumphorum*, and consularia parallels contemporary antiquarian interests in Rome's past. We saw in the last chapter that this interest led to the composition of chronicles, in particular the *Chronica* of Nepos and the *Liber annalis* of Atticus, as well as other more shadowy works, that attempted to produce an easy survey of Roman history and to synchronize that history with better-known Greek and Near Eastern histories. As the detailed study in Volume II will show, the Fasti Capitolini is very much an epigraphic *Liber annalis*, stripped down to its most fundamental superstructure of the leading magistrates of the city, and peppered with brief historical highlights. The *Acta triumphorum* Capitolina provides a separate listing of Rome's greatest generals and their victories, which framed the consular fasti on Augustus's arch. This was the only way that a chronicle like the *Liber annalis* could be compressed into a single set of inscriptions. And it is perhaps not too much to suggest that Atticus's *Liber annalis* itself, with its AUC and consular chronology, was the major spur to the development of consularia in the Augustan period. The above-noted inscribed fasti and consularia, therefore, must be considered in the same antiquarian context as the calendar commentaries of Fulvius and Flaccus; Varro's *De uita populi Romani*, *De gente populi Romani*, and *Antiquitates*; Atticus's *Liber annalis*; Livy's history; Ovid's *Fasti*; and the inscribed *Chronicon Romanum*.<sup>99</sup> Again, we must emphasize that, had the extant inscribed texts survived only in manuscript copies, we would have no trouble seeing them in this literary and historical context, which is where they belong.<sup>100</sup>

As demonstrated above, the similarity of the content and wording of inscribed calendars and consularia in widely separated cities demonstrates that Augustus employed some kind of 'Office of Public Information' to proclaim and disseminate information to the people of the empire. These sorts of widely disseminated notices, originally intended as news items and texts for commemoration at Rome,

<sup>99</sup> To show just how widespread this impulse was, one might even include Castor of Rhodes in this list, as does Feeney 2007: 63–65.

<sup>100</sup> See Rüpke 1995a and Rüpke 1997.



contributed materially to the development of a whole new historical genre when they were added to fasti that already contained such items as censors, *lustra*, and the deaths of magistrates in office. In particular it was the addition of references to wars and battles that first created consularia out of augmented fasti. We can see the process at work in the Fasti Capitolini and then in the Fasti Amiternini, Cuprenses, Venusini, and Tauromenitani, early works that might be best described as proto-consularia because of their general lack of annotation. Since every event to be announced and commemorated related to the imperial family, these notices soon became the natural focus of the consularia as well, and the Fasti Cuprenses and Gabini represent the next step in the development of consularia, when more of these commemorative notices began to be collected and added to pure fasti and what were already proto-consularia. The Fasti Ostienses represents the high point of such chronographic compilation in the early imperial period, and nothing like it would be seen again until the first version of the *Descriptio consulum* was compiled in the middle of the fourth century.

Very frequently local magistrates, such as *duoviri*, *quinquennales*, aediles, and quaestors were added to these epigraphic consular fasti and consularia. These gave the lists a visible local parallel to the changing Roman magistrates and established a synchronism between the two sets of annual cycles. Sometimes, as we find in the Fasti Ostienses, notices of local events might be added, but on present evidence this example is unique, as indeed is the Fasti Ostienses with its detailed descriptions of so many different types of imperial events. As far as we can tell, all the entries inscribed in that text apart from the first plaque originally derived from imperial dissemination of news and commemoration, but then, and gradually, other notices relating to local events and the magistrates began to creep in. In all cases the final decision regarding inclusion or exclusion of any notice lay with the compiler and the sort of record he wished to present to his local audience. He added whatever he thought was important and worth commemorating on the inscription, even down to the intricate details of Trajan's Dacian games. There is no evidence for any centralized or even local 'official' control or dictation of the text. The impetus was entirely private and personal. Again the Fasti Ostienses underlines this fact: what possible 'official' value could recording the details of Trajan's games have had for the decurions or *pontifices Volcani* of Ostia?

The consularia genre thus seems to have arisen for a number of reasons. The first was noted above: consularia are in a very real way abbreviated chronicles in the mould of Atticus's *Liber annalis* and perhaps their origins owe something to the publication of that work. In the second place, they are the natural evolution of the pre-chronicle interest in lists of consuls and censors that we have seen in the fasti

of M. Fulvius Nobilior and the *Fasti Antiates maiores*. Third, since the emperor and his family occupy by far the largest part of the contents of these consularia, these works also spoke publicly of an individual's connection to and support for Rome and her emperor. They are, like the calendars, public statements of Roman-ness and pride in being Roman, though unlike the calendars local magistrates and sometimes even local events could appear, making explicit the connection between the local and the imperial. And fourth, aristocratic competition drove wealthy individuals to erect these expensive works in public for all to see. Although evidence for consularia is very rare after the Julio-Claudian period, the genre itself survived into late antiquity. There, in written form, it provides some of our most important evidence for fourth- and fifth-century history. In the next chapter, we shall examine the late antique development of the originally Augustan and Julio-Claudian genre of consularia.

## CONSULARIA AND CHRONICLES IN THE LATER ROMAN EMPIRE

As we saw in the last chapter, consularia — or at least proto-consularia — were well established as a genre by the beginning of the imperial period and there is evidence, though on a relatively small scale, for its continuity into late antiquity. The last extant epigraphic consularia is the *Fasti Ostienses*, which will be treated at length in Volume II. This concluded around 178, its last surviving fragment coming from 175, by which point Ostia's long decline as Rome's port was well under way. The latest extant attestation for any form of early imperial consularia comes from about the same time, though it is found in a very unlikely place. The author of the *Historia Augusta*, writing in the 390s, added a number of excerpts from consularia to his life of the emperor Commodus, using them to supplement his main source or sources.<sup>1</sup> Unfortunately, it is impossible to tell whether the ultimate source for this material was literary or epigraphic. It would seem to be contemporary, given that it uses the fanciful names that Commodus invented for the Roman months, and we can be sure that the author of the *Historia Augusta* himself drew it from a written source. Apart from these limited traces in an always obscure text, we have no direct evidence for either manuscript or epigraphic consularia again until the fourth century.

<sup>1</sup> *Historia Augusta, Commodus* 11. 13–12. 9. The consularia excerpts cover the years 166, 172, 175, 176, 178, 180, and 188 and will be discussed and translated in Volume II. This is not the place to consider the sources of the *Historia Augusta*, one of the more controversial issues in fourth-century studies; suffice to say that we favour a minimalist approach to the number of sources used (as is adopted in Barnes 1978) and would dismiss altogether the vast recent literature on the supposed role of Nicomachus Flavianus in the composition of the work. For this, see now Alan Cameron 2010: 627–90.

This absence of evidence does not mean that such works were not still being written, however. The existence of the *Fasti Caleni* demonstrates that pure *fasti*, with consuls, *suffects*, and local magistrates, were still being inscribed and put on public display at the end of the third century, if only very rarely. The decline of the 'epigraphic habit' in the third century is a well-known phenomenon and so the disappearance of inscribed consularia and *fasti* needs no special explanation.<sup>2</sup> But the fact that even a few *fasti* continued to be inscribed in the third century — the *Fasti Palatini* and *Fasti Caleni* from 209–12 and 288–89 — does suggest that consularia probably continued to be compiled, and indeed inscribed, in a few towns or cities. That having been said, we need to stress a corollary of the fact, long known, that no extant sources contain so much as a trace of a precise and reliable chronology for the third and early fourth centuries. That sort of chronological framework is what consularia would have provided. The fact that no extant sources had access to it shows that whatever consularia were compiled in the third and fourth centuries were entirely inaccessible to historians who wrote in the later decades of the fourth century and thereafter.<sup>3</sup> When consularia do re-emerge in our records, they are written on papyrus and parchment rather than on stone.

In one sense, however, the fate of inscribed consularia is unconnected to the genre's later, literary life. We have already seen that even in the early empire, inscribed *fasti* and consularia were never consulted by the compilers of the manuscript *fasti* that remain extant (with the possible exception of the single excerpt in the *Historia Augusta*), certainly not in order to obtain accurate consular lists. Given that precedent, we would hardly expect to find anything different in the fourth and later centuries, and indeed we do not: records from earlier, inscribed consularia never appear in the manuscript consularia of late antiquity. In other words, even though inscribed consularia may still have been standing in various cities in the late third century, and even though a few calendars were being inscribed anew, there is no evidence that the compilers of manuscript consularia, let alone the authors of more complex narrative histories or *breviaria*, ever consulted them to obtain information about earlier centuries. The genre remained

<sup>2</sup> Mrozek 1973; MacMullen 1982; MacMullen 1986; MacMullen 1988: 3–5; Meyer 1990.

<sup>3</sup> The best example of this phenomenon is the *Descriptio consulum*: it provides exact day dates and factual details for many important events during the tetrarchy and the reign of Constantine, facts that would have been invaluable for any historian writing a history of the period, yet not a single surviving historical work shows any knowledge of them, whether from this or any other source. That is, third- and early fourth-century consularia existed, but we lack the indirect evidence for their existence.

the same, but with the decline of the epigraphic habit, it had by the fourth century shifted entirely from the inscribed to the manuscript sphere.

### *The Earliest Manuscript Consularia*

The earliest direct evidence for manuscript consularia appears in a recension of the *Descriptio consulum* compiled in Trier in the year 342. A block of material in this text, from the decades between the accession of Maximian in April 286 and the promotion of the sons of Constantine in September 337, clearly derives from the same type of commemoration notices that were used for the inscribed consularia and calendars of the early empire. We cannot tell whether this material derives from a single act of compilation or from multiple compilations between 286 and 337, but it was obviously preserved in a way that allowed the Trier compiler access to it in 342, when he was putting together his recension of the *Descriptio*.<sup>4</sup> Because this compilation was made in Trier (known because the two eclipses of 292 and 319 (each noted a year early) were both total in Trier but nowhere else (see Burgess 1993: 193–94)), because Trier was Maximian's principal residence from 286 to around 293, and because the consularia material begins with Maximian's promotion to augustus in 286, it is tempting to suppose that some local epigraphic consularia might have been the source for this early material, even though there is no positive evidence for such use of inscriptions. This block of material from 286 to 337, however, is not the earliest secular historical content in the *Descriptio*.

On the contrary, there is a small, scattered group of entries in 218 and between 261 and 285 which was probably excerpted from a single source at a single time, but could have been compiled from different sources and at different times.<sup>5</sup> Likewise, an account of the fourth century was originally available to the compiler of the *Consularia Vindobonensia*, but that continuous account now only begins in 379 and before that only the years 365 and 375 survive. An important point emerges from both these cases: neither the compiler of the third-century material in the *Descriptio* nor that of the fourth-century material in the *Consularia*

<sup>4</sup> The suggestion that a recension of the *Descriptio* ended in 314 refers to the underlying fasti, not the consularia, which must therefore have been added later (Burgess 1993: 191). This may indicate that the compilation of the Trier consularia contained in the *Descriptio* was later than 314, but the point cannot be proven since, as we can see from the *Consularia Berolinensia* (described in Volume II), historical entries could be removed from one set of fasti and added to another.

<sup>5</sup> The entry in 218 actually dates to 178. The transmission and sources of the *Descriptio* are described at length in Volume II.

*Vindobonensia* paid much attention to events before the dates from which their own roughly contemporary block of annual information began, hence the very sparse evidence for the earlier periods in both works.<sup>6</sup>

Alongside these meagre remains of non-contemporary history, we also have evidence for what might be called Christian proto-consularia. The consular list in the *Chronograph of 354* is for the most part pure fasti, yet it contains notices on the birth and death of Christ, the arrival of Paul and Peter in Rome, and their martyrdoms, written in almost exactly the style of consularia entries. A similar collection of Christian material appears in the *Descriptio consulum* and the *Consularia Vindobonensia*, noting, inter alia, the birth, crucifixion, and resurrection of Christ, the martyrdom of John the Baptist, the martyrdoms of Peter and Paul, the capture of Judaea, the death of Nero, the conquest of the Jews, and the death of Domitian.<sup>7</sup> Furthermore, a single set of martyrological notices appeared in a common source used by Prosper and the author of the original consularia that lies behind the extant *Consularia Vindobonensia*, *Consularia Berolinensia*, and *Consularia Scaligeriana* for the years between 203 and 336, since these share references to the martyrdoms of Perpetua and Felicitas, Laurence, Cyprian, and Timothy, and to the translation of the relics of the martyr Andrew and Luke to Constantinople.<sup>8</sup> In the *Descriptio* there are five later Christian entries relating to persecution and martyrdom (*s.aa.* 112, 161b, 167, 251, and 258), at least two of which were added from Jerome's *Chronici canones* at a much later date (161b and 167 on the martyrdoms of Polycarp and Pionius).

All the material in these proto-consularia revolves around Christ and early Christian martyrdoms, but the general style is the same as that of both the early imperial epigraphic consularia and proto-consularia and the manuscript consularia of the fourth century and beyond. This is a result of their perceived genre: even though different authors composed or compiled these entries, they all understood that entries added to fasti had to be written in a certain style, even though the

<sup>6</sup> That is to say, the compiler of the *Descriptio* includes only a few random notes before 286 and the compiler of the *Consularia Vindobonensia* ignored material in his source before 379, at which point the popular and accessible narrative of Jerome's *Chronici canones* ended.

<sup>7</sup> The material in both these latter texts ultimately had a common source, as is proved by the common selection of events and the idiosyncratic entry on the death of Nero: 'Nero non comparuit' (*Descriptio*) and 'Nero de imperio non comparuit' (*Consularia Vindobonensia*). This common fasti source also supplied the apparent chronicle excerpts between 112 and 16 BC in both texts (see Chapter 2, note 107 for the details). For the relationship among the consularia mentioned in this paragraph, see Burgess 2000.

<sup>8</sup> Burgess 2003: 24–28.

content was Christian. The only exception to this is the third-century secular entries in the *Descriptio* mentioned just above. The demonstrable close relationships among these groups of Christian entries and the surrounding fasti in works that are otherwise unrelated show that we are dealing with entries that were added to plain fasti, at a date before the extant consularia were first compiled. These Christian proto-consularia probably originated in the first quarter of the fourth century, or more plausibly at the very end of the third, and so were certainly not influenced by inscriptions erected in the first or second century AD.

Thus, although we may have no direct evidence for full-blown consularia of the early imperial epigraphic type between the notices on Commodus from the 180s and the *Descriptio consulum* in the mid-fourth century, indirect evidence does push the origins of the late antique consularia (or rather proto-consularia) tradition into the early fourth century, if not the late third century. Just as we see historical entries added to Easter tables in the sixth, seventh, and eighth centuries, readers and copyists were similarly adding entries to fasti in the early fourth and even the late third centuries as well.

### *The Descriptio consulum and the Consularia Italica*

In what follows to the end of this chapter we shall necessarily be brief, since the subjects of these sections will be treated in great detail in Volume II.

The first recension of the *Descriptio consulum*, our earliest direct evidence for the full manuscript consularia tradition of late antiquity, can be traced to the year 342 and the Gallic city of Trier. For some time, these consularia remained in the West, probably in or near Rome, where a number of contemporary entries were added, but they were taken to Constantinople at a date in the early 350s. By 356, entries relating to that city begin to appear regularly in the extant text. These particular consularia became very popular in Constantinople: they produced many descendants there from about 370, both with continuations in Latin and as translations into Greek, which themselves received continuations into the early sixth century. In 389, a recension of this Constantinopolitan *Descriptio* was taken back to the West by Achantia, the Spanish widow of the praetorian prefect Maternus Cynegius. From Spain, copies spread throughout the West, to Carthage, Rome, and then back to Spain. It is a copy of that well-travelled text that survives.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>9</sup> See Burgess 1993: 175–207. The many ramifications of this complex text will be discussed in detail in Volume II.

The *Descriptio* is just one part of a much larger phenomenon. For reasons that we cannot now understand, the last third of the fourth century witnessed an explosion of interest in chronography, in the form of both consularia and chronicles. As we have just seen, the *Descriptio* spawned continuations in both East and West beginning in the 370s. It was likewise in 379 that Jerome decided to translate, augment, and continue Eusebius's *Chronici canones*. He used a Constantinopolitan continuation of the *Descriptio* as one of his sources to augment Eusebius. Also at this time, probably between 372 and 375, Petronius Probus requested a copy of Cornelius Nepos's *Chronica* from Ausonius.<sup>10</sup> Finally, probably in the years immediately following 378, the Greek historian Eunapius made his well-known attack on Dexippus in particular and historians who were overly concerned with chronology in general, saying that 'concern for precision in recording seasons and days is appropriate for the managers and accountants of the rich, and, of course, those who gape at the heavens and all others who obviously apply themselves to counting'. He went on to argue that 'the practice [... of dating] events by the year or the day [...] is irrelevant', before concluding that he would 'leave it to others to dance off into the delusion of dating by year and day'.<sup>11</sup> Whether or not this diatribe was meant to disguise Eunapius's own lack of detailed chronological information — as it may well have been — the fact that he could couch his point in such terms demonstrates the prevalence of chronographic writing in both East and West at the time: chronography was in fashion.<sup>12</sup>

Another fact further underscores that conclusion: at some point, also in the second half of the fourth century, another family of consularia appeared in Italy, perhaps inspired by the western descendants of Achantia's *Descriptio*. What we possess today is a group of texts collectively entitled the Consularia Italica by Theodor Mommsen in his *Chronica minora* edition.<sup>13</sup> The origins of these consularia are unknown, since we have only a single fragment of an uncontaminated text: the *Consularia Marsiburgensia*, the modern name for the surviving half page of

<sup>10</sup> See Chapter 2, note 109 and Chapter 3, p. 128 for Ausonius, and for Probus, see *PLRE*, 736–40, s.v. Probus 5. See Chapter 2 above and Volume II for Nepos. It would be interesting to know if Nepos's *Chronica* had been continued at some point in the centuries that intervened between its original composition and Probus's request, but there is no evidence.

<sup>11</sup> Frag. 1. 79–90 (Blockley 1983: 10–11). For more of this quotation, see 'Chapter 1, note 11' in the Appendices to the Footnotes, p. 358 below.

<sup>12</sup> For the influence of chronography on a historian like Dexippus, Eunapius's explicit target and a historian writing in c. 270, see Appendix 1 below. In general, see Liebeschuetz 2003: 196–97.

<sup>13</sup> Mommsen 1892: 249–339.



parchment from Merseburg Cathedral that contains this text. All the other evidence for the *Consularia Italica* survives in later chronicles or compilations from between the late fifth and fifteenth centuries, particularly the *Consularia Vindobonensia*. Nonetheless, the detailed and accurate information for its early years does suggest that the date of the original compilation was the late fourth century, though it may, of course, have been earlier: as noted above, we have lost whatever was originally present before 379, presumably because Jerome's chronicle was felt by later compilers to have covered that period more fully.

After the later fourth century, one strand of the *Consularia Italica* tradition can be traced in Hydatius and Prosper through the last quarter of the fourth century and the first quarter of the fifth. Another tradition, one that would eventually form the basis of the most common version, can be seen as early as 452 in the *Gallic Chronicle*. Still another version dates to 456, and a fourth was used by Cassiodorus in 518. The former appears to have travelled to Alexandria in the 460s, a version witnessed by the *Chronographia* of Theophanes. The most popular version was extended to 493 and appears in the most important surviving witnesses: the *Consularia Vindobonensia* (which provide the earliest evidence for compilation, beginning in 379 with two earlier entries in 365 and 375) and the *Excerpta Sangallensia* (which provide the latest, extending down to 572), the *Consularia Hafniensia*, the early chapters of the second part of the *Anonymus Valesianus*, the *Liber pontificalis ecclesiae Rauennatis* of Andreas Agnellus, the *Paschale Campanum*, the *Gallic Chronicle of 511*, and the chronicle of Marcellinus *comes*. It is this version (via the tradition represented by the *Consularia Vindobonensia posteriora*) that appears in the *Consularia Scaligeriana* and *Consularia Golenischevensia*. After 493, sporadic entries appear in some individual documents, but there is no evidence for widespread continued annual maintenance.<sup>14</sup>

Meanwhile, as the *Consularia Italica* ramified across the western provinces, local recensions of the *Descriptio consulum* were still being compiled back in Constantinople. Although none of these late recensions is still extant, it is clear that they were used by Marcellinus *comes* down to c. 512 and by the author of the *Chronicon Paschale* (of c. 630) down to 468. Although the *Chronicon Paschale* and Marcellinus share a large number of entries, they appear to have relied on two separate yet overlapping sources, rather than a single source that each author excerpted in a different way. It is, however, very difficult to be certain, and both sources may

<sup>14</sup> The divagations of the *Consularia Italica* tradition, more complex even than those of the *Descriptio consulum*, will be traced in detail in Volume II.

be separate recensions that go back to a single common source.<sup>15</sup> This question too will be analysed in Volume II.

Apart from the very extensive *Consularia Italica* tradition, the last examples of consularia come from the third quarter of the sixth century in Spain and the last quarter of the sixth century in Constantinople. Neither survives in its original form. The Spanish example, now called the *Consularia Caesaraugustana*, is known only from excerpts jotted in the margins of a lost sixteenth-century manuscript of the chronicles of Victor of Tunnuna and John of Biclar, which now survives only in a number of later copies.<sup>16</sup> These excerpts extend from 450 to 568, and given the general frequency of citation, the work probably did not extend beyond the 570s. Although only thirty-three disembodied entries survive, it seems likely that the original was written as a continuation of some kind of regular consularia, though no entry demonstrates a parallel with any extant consularia tradition. One may suspect that these consularia were a local continuation of the late fourth-century Spanish recension of the *Descriptio*, but that cannot be proved. That it was indeed a consularia text and not a chronicle is suggested by a number of factors. Its chronology was organized by consuls, and entries are usually introduced with 'His coss.' or 'Hoc cos.'<sup>17</sup> The entries, although they do not now contain day dates, are written in the telegraphic style typical of the consularia genre and avoid any reference to ecclesiastical matters. All in all, the text appears to have been a brave attempt at continuing pre-existing consularia in the absence both of the type of sources that compilers of such works usually had at their disposal (hence the lack of dates) and of any consuls over its last thirty-odd years. Frequent references to the city of Zaragoza make it reasonably certain that this work was written there or nearby, hence its title.<sup>18</sup>

<sup>15</sup> Croke believes that Marcellinus and the author of the *Chronicon Paschale* used a single source that continued right down to the time of the composition of Marcellinus's second edition (534). See Croke 1995: xxiv–xxv; Croke 2001a: 179–81, 184–86.

<sup>16</sup> Cardelle de Hartmann 2001: 13\*–93\*.

<sup>17</sup> 'His diebus' is also frequent.

<sup>18</sup> The references to Zaragoza occur *s.aa.* 460, 504, 506, 541 = Cardelle de Hartmann 23a, 85a, 87a, 130a. Cardelle de Hartmann 2001: 115\*–24\* was the first to give the work the title of *Consularia Caesaraugustana*, in preference to Mommsen's *Chronica Caesaraugustana*, recognizing that the work was probably consularia, not chronicle, in origin. Once recognized as consularia, the work can no longer be confused with the *historiola* of Maximus, bishop of Zaragoza, which we touch on briefly in Chapter 6.

The last consularia for which we have any evidence were worked into the larger and more complex chronicle structure of the *Chronicon Paschale*, probably around 630. At the heart of this large work is a Greek version of the *Descriptio consulum*. This version had been continued down to about 468 with local Constantinopolitan consularia that were also used as a source by Marcellinus *comes*. Another continuation, or perhaps completely different consularia altogether, is visible in the *Chronicon Paschale* from about 582, which then continues down into the seventh century, but later compilation and the much more detailed chronicle- and *breviarium*-type content from 602 make it difficult to say anything precise.<sup>19</sup> Nevertheless the *Chronicon Paschale* is the last historical work to rely on consular dates.

As these many different works in their many different recensions show, consularia were immensely popular from the middle of the fourth until the beginning of the sixth century and even beyond, both in such major imperial centres as Trier, Constantinople, Alexandria, Rome, and Ravenna, and in more distant provinces like Spain. As a genre, however, consularia had no great future, for three reasons. First, the crises faced by the western emperors from the middle of the fifth century, and then the fall of the western empire, rapidly produced a major change in the way that information was disseminated throughout the West. It is clear that the promulgation and dissemination by the imperial government of the type of information that was essential to the consularia genre broke down completely after the Ostrogothic conquest in 493. As a result, the sort of information that had in the fourth century been widely obtainable was now much harder to come by than it had been under the last western emperors or even under Odoacar, who seems to have announced a number of his victories. What is more, changes in the dissemination of information seem to have had an effect even in Constantinople: the material that we can trace in Marcellinus and the *Chronicon Paschale* is rather different from what we see in the *Descriptio consulum*, relating more to the city than to the empire as a whole. Eastern emperors must have continued to make announcements as they had in the past, but it would seem that the imperial calendar was becoming more ecclesiastical, while the emperor, his family, and his deeds were less and less a part of the annual commemorations. This meant a decline in the number of annual commemoration notices that were circulated. Additionally, interest in the city of Constantinople itself, as opposed to the emperor or the empire, is obvious in both Marcellinus and the *Chronicon Paschale*. That reflects a reduction in the horizons of the fifth and sixth centuries and an increase in a local,

<sup>19</sup> Whitby and Whitby 1989: xvii–xviii, xix–xx.

Constantinopolitan perspective by contrast to an imperial one.<sup>20</sup> Constantinople, in other words, experienced the same regionalization and diminution of horizons as did the fifth-century West.

A second factor in the decline of the consularia genre was the end of the annual consulship itself in 541, in which year Basilius was the last private citizen to hold the office. The title was later assumed by emperors after their accessions, but within almost exactly one hundred years it was finally abandoned for good.<sup>21</sup> To some extent, however, this may have been irrelevant; most consularia that we can still trace had ceased to be compiled by then. The *Descriptio* concluded in 388, its western continuations in 468, and its eastern continuations in 468 and 512. The *Consularia Vindobonensia priora* and the chronicle source used by Marcellinus *comes* finished in 493 (though the former is just an artefact of the manuscript tradition, because the *Excerpta Sangallensia* derive from the same tradition and continue to 572; see below), the *Consularia Hafniensia* finished in 523, the *Consularia Vindobonensia posteriora* in 539, and the *Paschale Campanum* in 512. Only the entries in the *Excerpta Sangallensia* continue much past the consulship of Basilius, its original compiler trying to maintain the year-by-year accounting down to at least 572 with post-consulates of Basilius and Justin II. Victor of Tunnuna continued his chronicle down to the twenty-third year after the consulship of Basilius (563) and then shifted to the regnal years of Justinian. Marius of Avenches went on using the post-consulate of Basilius for twenty-five years; he then shifted to post-consulates of the accession consulship of Justin II (566) and then Tiberius II (574) down to the year 581. The *Chronicon Paschale* is the last extant document to have been composed under the influence of consular chronology. It continues in the same manner as did Marius, following post-consulates of Basilius and then post-consulates of the accession consulships of Justin II, Tiberius, Maurice, Phocas, and Heraclius. We should stress that Victor, Marius, and the *Chronicon Paschale* are none of them consularia. They are chronicles that use consular dates and had consularia sources or, in the case of the *Chronicon Paschale*, a chronicle that incorporates consularia as one of its major sources.

<sup>20</sup> This phenomenon is also evident in the rise of a new genre of miscellaneous writing about the city, in works collectively known to modern scholars as the *Scriptores Originum Constantinopolitanarum*, for which see Dagron 1984 and Chapter 6 below.

<sup>21</sup> After both East and West were left for twenty-four years counting years by the post-consulate of Basilius, Justin II took the consular title in 566 during his first regnal year (and did so again in 568). In this practice, he was followed by his imperial successors down to 642: Bagnall and Worp 2004: 94–98, 207–16 and *CLRE*, 12.

All the historical changes we have been discussing no doubt contributed to the decline of the consularia genre, but the final and most important reason was undoubtedly the rising popularity of the chronicle. In the fifth and sixth centuries, this very old genre absorbed, and then rapidly replaced, consularia as the primary chronographic approach to writing about the past. Consularia, as we have noted, had always been a minority genre, no doubt because of the constraints imposed by their strict rules of content and style. They tended to be seen as practical documents and sources for the writing of history, rather than as literary and historical compositions in their own right. Over time, they must have seemed very old-fashioned in comparison with chronicles, which allowed more room for individualism in composition, universalism in content, freedom for description, and the introduction of ecclesiastical history. Even one of the compilers of the common source of the *Consularia Italica* resorted to a more chronicle-like account when he came to write about the war between Theoderic and Odoacar. Similarly, a sixth-century editor of the *Consularia Hafniensia* tried to expand its style into something more literary, though he lacked the skill and so failed; its final continuator did not even bother with chronology, but instead wrote a very short *breviarium*-style narrative down to 625. The author of the *Anonymus Valesianus*, by contrast, succeeded in embellishing and expanding the bare entries he found in a recension of the *Consularia Italica* and fashioned them into a continuous narrative for the preface to his *breviarium*-style biography of Theoderic.

And so, with the growth in the popularity of the *Chronici canones*, writers chose to follow Jerome and his continuators, using the criteria of style and content he provided in place of the more rigid generic constraints of the consularia. Authors like Prosper, Marcellinus, and Marius of Avenches show how chroniclers could absorb the consular chronology to their own advantage. Cassiodorus, for his part, demonstrates that even authors who set out to compose consularia in the sixth century ended up by restructuring their works into a more chronicle-like form. Only those consularia that were already in circulation retained the old form and content. For the most part, by the mid-sixth century, with the end of the practice of commemoration notices and the end of the consulship, consularia had ceased to exist and chronicles were left the dominant historiographical genre.

As we noted in Chapter 1, the impetus to record important events in the briefest manner possible was not completely lost with consularia, but seems to have been passed on to Easter tables. Two manuscripts of Victorius's Easter table (completed in 457), which uses consuls as its dating system, contain single historical annotations in 501 and 525; the *Fasti Parisini* contains a single entry under 490; while the *Paschale Campanum* contains a large number of entries added to the

consuls of its Easter table between 465 and 512.<sup>22</sup> The next direct evidence for such annotations in Easter tables appears in 620 in Britain, in the Frankish Annals of Lindisfarne and Kent (the *Annales Iuuauenses*). However, there is indirect evidence to suggest that notes of local events in a mid-fifth-century English Easter table led mid-sixth-century Irish churchmen to begin compiling similar notes in the same, reused Easter table. These notes eventually led to the creation of the famous Irish annals in the seventh and eighth centuries.<sup>23</sup>

### *Jerome and his Continuator*

Jerome, as we saw in Chapter 2, probably first came upon the Greek text of Eusebius's *Chronici canones*, along with its associated Antiochene continuation, in Antioch in 379. When he travelled to Constantinople the following year in the lead up to the council of Constantinople, he found a copy of the *Descriptio consulum* there. The text of the *Descriptio* known to Jerome parallels the extant version down to 370 (245<sup>m</sup>) and seems to have been continued to about 373 (247<sup>b</sup>). Using this text and original research to extend his translation from 350, when the Antiochene continuation of the *Canones* ended, to 378, he finished his work before the council concluded in early July. He took the completed chronicle with him to Rome during the summer of the following year (382), when he visited Pope Damasus. While there is no evidence for its use in the East apart from the continuation of Marcellinus *comes*, Jerome's translation spread throughout the West — we have evidence that it was read in Italy, Gaul, Spain, and Africa — and in time it became the basis for all late Roman Latin chronicles, inspiring a large number of continuations of which only a handful has survived.

The earliest continuation of which we know was completed in southern Gaul in 433 by Prosper of Aquitaine, who twice continued his own continuation in Gaul, in 445 and again in 455.<sup>24</sup> Prosper was heavily influenced by the consularia tradition and not particularly interested in either the period before the birth of Christ or Eusebius's original structural conception. He therefore added consuls

<sup>22</sup> For the details of these additions, see Chapter 1, notes 91 and 92, and for a translation of the *Paschale Campanum*, see Appendix 5, section 1.6.

<sup>23</sup> For all this, see Chapter 6.

<sup>24</sup> Although one often reads that there was an edition in 451 (Mommsen 1892: 345, 347; Muhlberger 1990: 56–57, 115–21), there is no real evidence to support this belief. See the full demonstration in Volume III.

from the Crucifixion and removed Jerome's chronological apparatus of Olympiads, regnal years, and years from the birth of Abraham. To facilitate this new structure, and to reduce the bulk of the text, he also reduced Jerome's chronicle to an epitome, particularly before the Crucifixion, and added a chronology of world history between the creation of the world and the birth of Abraham in order to make good that gap in Eusebius-Jerome.

Prosper's was not the only fifth-century continuation of Jerome, and an anonymous southern Gallic continuation was completed in 452. In contrast to Prosper's epitome, this *Gallic Chronicle of 452* was appended to a full text of Jerome, preserving and continuing his full chronological apparatus.<sup>25</sup> Thereafter, the record switches to Spain, or rather what is today northern Portugal, where a local bishop named Hydatius completed a continuation of Jerome down to 468/69. Like the Gallic chronicler of 452, Hydatius retained Jerome's chronological apparatus, but he also added his own: Spanish eras, a local chronology that counted from 38 BC, and a countdown from the crucifixion according to Jubilees, a Jewish reckoning of fifty-year intervals.<sup>26</sup>

The next chronicle for which we have any evidence is probably an epitome of a larger chronicle, or even an epitome of an epitome. It, too, was written in southern Gaul, in or near Arles, and the surviving version ends in 511 with the death of the emperor Anastasius. It was added to a very short epitome of Jerome which had, like Prosper's epitome, been augmented in places. This *Gallic Chronicle of 511* certainly used the *Gallic Chronicle of 452* and Hydatius as sources, as well as an unknown chronicle from Arles that extended at least to the accession of the Gothic king Alaric II in 484. One can also detect parallels to Marius of Avenches, Isidore, and the *Consularia Caesaraugustana*.<sup>27</sup> This *Gallic Chronicle of 511* is the earliest known Latin chronicle that is more of a work of compilation than of composition, and hence a harbinger of early medieval trends.

Across the Roman world, it was the sixth century that witnessed the final stages of the late antique chronicle tradition. In 518, the Illyrian Marcellinus *comes* completed a continuation of Jerome in Constantinople. Like Prosper, whose work he did not know, Marcellinus jettisoned Jerome's chronological structure and replaced it with consuls. To this framework he also added indictions, the numbered tax cycles invented by the tetrarchy that had come to be used as a dating system in

<sup>25</sup> See Burgess 2001a.

<sup>26</sup> See Burgess 1988 and Burgess 1993.

<sup>27</sup> See Burgess 2001b.

the East and a few places in the West like southern Gaul.<sup>28</sup> Marcellinus's use of consuls was influenced by a copy of the *Consularia Italica*, and he used Orosius and local Constantinopolitan sources as well, at least one of which he shared with the early seventh-century *Chronicon Paschale*, as noted above. Marcellinus later continued his own chronicle down to 534, and that continuation was itself continued, probably in Italy, though that is controversial, at some date after 548, at which point our unique manuscript of the text comes to an end.<sup>29</sup>

As we saw in our discussion of nomenclature and genre in Chapter 1, on 1 January 519 the Roman bureaucrat and man of letters Cassiodorus presented an interesting hybrid of consularia and chronicle to the Gothic prince Eutharic in honour of his consulship that year. Cassiodorus's work is at heart a consular list, the normal sort of gift one presented to a new consul, but Cassiodorus expanded it in two ways. First of all, he annotated the basic consular fasti to create consularia, with the text from 455 heavily influenced by a modified version of the *Consularia Italica* tradition. Second, to make the work more like a chronicle, he added a *supputatio* from Creation to the accession of Ninus, first king of the Assyrians; a list of Assyrian, Latin, and Roman kings which bridged the gap between Ninus and the beginning of the fasti; and infrequent historical annotations for the most part from an epitome of Livy, Jerome, and Prosper down to 455.<sup>30</sup>

In Gaul, the bishop Marius of Avenches composed a chronicle in continuation of Prosper down to 581. The text, however, only survives as a continuation of the *Gallic Chronicle of 452*, and so entries from Prosper for 453 to 455 have been added to bridge the gap between the end of the Gallic chronicle and the beginning of Marius.<sup>31</sup>

The last two late antique chronicles in Latin known to us are closely related, not only in that one is a continuation of the other, but also because the manuscript evidence for them all derives from the same small group of late Spanish manuscripts. The chronicle of Victor of Tunnuna (in north Africa, though he spent most of the last years of his life in prison in Alexandria and Constantinople) was completed shortly after the accession of Justin II in 565.<sup>32</sup> He continued Prosper's chronicle,

<sup>28</sup> For indictions, see Chapter 4, note 10.

<sup>29</sup> Croke 1995 and 2001a.

<sup>30</sup> The best studies of the chronicle are still Mommsen 1894: 111–19 and O'Donnell 1979: 36–43. Klaassen 2010 includes a new critical edition.

<sup>31</sup> Favrod 1993: 11–60. Favrod's text, however, is inferior to that of Mommsen 1894: 232–39.

<sup>32</sup> Cardelle de Hartmann 2001: 95\*–115\*. Tunnuna: *BA*, 32.F3.



but brazenly implies that Prosper stopped in 443, despite the fact that Prosper obviously forms an important source for his text between 444 and 455.<sup>33</sup> Victor was in turn continued down to 589 by John, abbot of the monastery he founded at Biclár in Spain and later Bishop of Girona.<sup>34</sup>

John's chronicle was the last of the late antique chronicles, written almost exactly two hundred years after Jerome's chronicle appeared in the West. Although Jerome's chronicle had been the spur to chronicle writing for a second generation of Latin chroniclers — Prosper, Hydatius, and the anonymous Gallic chronicler of 452 — it was Prosper's chronicle that inspired the third generation of sixth-century chroniclers: Cassiodorus, Victor, Marius, and John. Meanwhile, the lack of a Latin tradition of chronicling in the East meant that Marcellinus was left to fill in a gap of 140 years between the end of Jerome and his own day, which accounts for the sparseness of the information early in his continuation.

This means that John of Biclár was the last chronicler to write in the unbroken ancient tradition that went back to the Parian Marble and beyond. It would be several centuries before anything like it was written again. After John, the next work in Latin anything like a chronicle was that of Isidore in 615, a text that was expanded and continued in 626. It was a different kind of chronicle altogether, unlike anything that had gone before apart from Prosper's epitome of Jerome and a severe epitome of earlier chronicles organized by reign, not by the annual accounting of years. As was seen in Chapter 1, we do not actually consider this work a proper chronicle, since it dispenses with annalistic accounting and has no overriding interest in chronology, and is therefore what we call a chronicle epitome. This text was itself then epitomized even more drastically to produce a third edition that was included in Isidore's *Etymologiae*, which he never completely finished. This was the text that would spur Bede to compose his first chronicle epitome in 703, chapters sixteen to twenty-two of his book *De temporibus*. Bede's second, larger chronicle was written in 725 and it occupied chapter sixty-six of his *De temporum ratione*. Isidore's first two editions and Bede's second in particular would go on to rival Jerome for influence in the early Middle Ages, the subject of the next and final chapter of this volume.

<sup>33</sup> See Muhlberger 1986.

<sup>34</sup> Cardelle de Hartmann 2001: 124\*–143\*. Biclár: *BA*, 25.F4; Girona (Gerunda): *BA*, 25.H4.



## CHRONICLES IN THE MIDDLE AGES

As we move to a discussion of the chronicle genre in the Middle Ages, it will be useful to remind the reader of our discussion of genre and nomenclature in Chapter 1. The ancient Mediterranean chronicle tradition, with which this volume and those that follow are primarily concerned, survived into the Middle Ages. Indeed, it is the only ancient literary genre that has a direct and continuous history from antiquity into the medieval era in both the Latin and the Greek worlds. That said, however, what western medievalists are accustomed to call chronicles are not chronicles in the ancient sense adopted here and neither are the works that Byzantinists generally call ‘world chronicles’ or ‘Byzantine chronicles’. Medievalists, for reasons discussed in our first chapter, tend to draw a distinction between the fuller narrative and literary genre that they call ‘chronicle’ and the thinner, year-by-year accounts that they call ‘annals’, although what actually distinguishes ‘annals’ from ‘chronicle’ is the topic of endless and often arid dispute. Byzantinists, meanwhile, use ‘chronicle’ to refer to long universal histories running from Creation to the time of writing. Both the world chronicles of Byzantium and the long, narrative chronicles of the Latin West have generic analogues in the ancient world, but they do not represent a continuous development out of ancient genres.<sup>1</sup> What medievalists usually call ‘annals’, however, have precisely such a development: for what medievalists call ‘annals’ are both analogous to and directly descended from the ancient chronicle genre.

<sup>1</sup> Annalistic narrative history like Livy’s *Ab urbe condita* is roughly analogous to a massive late medieval ‘chronicle’, while a universal history like that of Diodorus Siculus can be considered more or less comparable to the Byzantine ‘world chronicles’, though both ancient analogues are much longer than their medieval counterparts. Needless to say, neither would have been considered a chronicle by those who wrote them.

It is in that ancient sense that we have been defining chronicles in the present volume. All medievalists, eastern and western, recognize the late antique roots of the chronicle genre, though they generally look no further back than Eusebius-Jerome, or occasionally Africanus and Hippolytus.<sup>2</sup> But the stylistic element of Eusebius-Jerome that they imagine to be the generically definitive one is the universality of the text, not its chronographic form.<sup>3</sup> As we have seen in this volume hitherto, however, as a generic form chronicles need not be universal. It is not universality that defines the genre. On the contrary, it is the chronographic framework, indeed the chronographic constraints, that define 'chronicle'. From the genre's ancient Near Eastern origins all the way through the end of antiquity and beyond, the main characteristic of the chronicle form is the subordination of content to the chronographic framework; that is, the chronographic frame can be retained even where there is no content to report, while content that cannot be assigned a date within the chronographic frame cannot be recorded. Given the primacy of the chronographic frame, the brevity with which content is recorded is another key characteristic of the genre and tends to lead to a paratactic style that renders it difficult or impossible to distinguish the relative importance of any individual item of content or the relationship (if any) of one entry (or 'annal') to another. Causal relations are generally absent, individual entries related to one another by *consécution* not *conséquence*.

With that understood as our premise, in this final chapter we survey the history of the chronicle genre into the Middle Ages, in both the Byzantine East and the Latin West, carrying the story through to the twelfth century. By that time, in both East and West, a full panoply of historical genres had developed, both re-creating many of the distinct modes of writing about the past that had existed in antiquity while also developing new ones. More important from our perspective, until the

<sup>2</sup> Even the otherwise fundamental Dumville 2002 only begins with Eusebius. The well-known works of Jones (see Chapter 1, note 4) and von den Brincken (1957) go back to Africanus and Hippolytus, and some have followed their lead (e.g. Krüger 1976). McGuire is one of the very few medievalists who makes an attempt to bring the earliest Mediterranean chronicles into account (see Chapter 1, note 9). Despite our criticism of McCormick 1975 in our discussion of nomenclature — it perpetuates the faulty definitions of Poole — the work remains a useful introduction to the chronicle genre (what it calls 'annals') in the Middle Ages.

<sup>3</sup> An exception is Kazhdan 1999: 234, who believes that annalistic writing is a fundamentally medieval style, so that Theophanes 'is not only a historian; he is also a medieval annalist'. On medieval 'universal chronicles' and the various proposed defining features, see Krüger 1976. Indeed, a case could be made for the Parian Marble's being a 'universal chronicle', at least in terms of its inception point.

twelfth century the chronicles produced in late antiquity continued to be used directly as sources for those authors writing in the chronicle genre. We have chosen to conclude our discussion of the western tradition with the early twelfth-century chronicle of Sigebert of Gembloux, the last medieval work of original chronological research that is still visibly part of the tradition of antiquity; in the East, we briefly consider the *Kleinchroniken* or short chronicles that flourished at the end of the Byzantine period, in the same sort of circumstances that led to the efflorescence of the chronicle genre in late antiquity.

As we saw above in Chapter 5, the Latin genre of consularia had by the sixth century been folded into the more flexible, and rather more extensive, chronicle genre; the sixth-century abolition of the consulship simply concluded a process that was already long since underway. In both West and East, ancient chronicles in the mode of Eusebius and Jerome continued to exercise a strong influence on the shrinking horizons of early medieval societies, even as other ancient historiographical genres, like biography and history, disappeared altogether. (In Greek, classicizing history came to an end in the early seventh century with Theophylact Simocatta; in the west, Gregory of Tours and Bede wrote the only full-scale narrative histories attested between the very early fifth century and Otto of Freising in the twelfth.) Yet at the same time that the model of Eusebius-Jerome continued to exercise its influence, a new approach to the writing of chronicles was invented in the early Middle Ages. This genuinely medieval development will occupy us for the next few pages, for while many late antique chronicles were transmitted to the Middle Ages, it was only chronicle epitomes on the model of Isidore and Bede that actually bridged the gap between the age of Justinian and the rise of the Carolingians.

### *Isidore, Bede, and Ireland: The Beginnings of a Medieval Chronicle Tradition*

There is no question that the medieval chronicle tradition developed directly from the long-established ancient mode of chronicle writing, both as retrospective and contemporary compilation. In Latin, chronicles composed as direct continuations of complete ancient chronicles, however, died out with Victor of Tunnuna and John of Biclar. In the Greek East, the last of the ancient-style chronicles is the *Chronicon Paschale* which, like John's continuation of Victor in Spain, was written very early in the seventh century. The seventh century, in chronicling as in many other spheres, represents the final transformation of ancient traditions into something no longer recognizably ancient at all. In this respect, the seventh and earlier eighth centuries witnessed a genuinely new historiographical development in

chronicling, a variation on the ancient genre that we shall call the chronicle epitome, with the stress on the 'epitome' rather than the 'chronicle' side of this subgenre since it does not offer the analistic account of a true chronicle. The inclusion of Isidore and Bede in the second and third volumes of Mommsen's *Chronica minora*, in direct succession to earlier Latin chronicles, has helped to make them seem rather closer to the ancient tradition than they actually are. There is, however, a very large difference between the works of Isidore and Bede and works like the chronicles of Victor and John, even though all were written within a century and a half of each other. Where Victor and John perpetuate the annalistic, year-by-year chronicling tradition of their predecessors, Isidore's chronicle is an epitome of earlier chronicles, very heavily abbreviated in its earliest period and becoming only somewhat more extensive as it nears Isidore's own time. In this way, Isidore effectively invented a new type of chronicle, no longer a continuation of Jerome or the consularia tradition, but rather a new tradition of universal epitome that transmitted material from ancient chronicles to the early Middle Ages. It is worth emphasizing, however, that despite the novelty of his approach and our classification of his work as an epitome, Isidore clearly believed that he was working within the ancient chronicling tradition.<sup>4</sup>

Along with the invention of the chronicle epitome, another important historiographical development of the early Middle Ages is the spread of the chronicle tradition into regions that had not been part of the Roman Empire. So it was that Ireland, which had never shared in the classical tradition of writing history, became an important centre both of new chronicle writing and of the transmission of ancient chronicles to later periods. In discussing the beginnings of the new early medieval chronicle, we can turn first to Isidore and the Spanish tradition before moving on to Anglo-Saxon England and early Christian Ireland.

### Isidore of Seville

Although the Iberian peninsula was by no means a central part of the Roman Empire and though its literary production in the Roman imperial period was quite limited, the ancient chronicle tradition was transmitted to the Latin Middle Ages through Spain. What is more, in Spain the form of the late antique chronicle was decisively transformed. To the universal and local chronicles that had existed in the ancient world, a new type of chronicle was added in the seventh century. This new

<sup>4</sup> See Chapter 1, note 50.

chronicle genre is what we have called, for want of a better term, the chronicle epitome: universal, but highly abbreviated; based on the reign not the year; and also chronographically uncomplicated. As far as anyone can tell, this was the invention of Isidore of Seville, who drew his direct inspiration from Prosper's epitome of Jerome, as we saw in Chapter 1. It was widely imitated in the early Middle Ages and in fact became the normative form of chronicle: because Isidore was heavily used by Bede, his new form of chronicle was transmitted to every corner of the Latin-speaking world, first via Anglo-Saxon missionary efforts and then by the spread of Carolingian hegemony. So it was that, along with the *Chronica*, Isidore's other works and particularly his *Etymologiae* went on to serve as textbooks for medieval Europe. As we saw in Chapter 5, it was another Spaniard, John of Biclar, who left us the very last western chronicle in the late antique tradition, continuing as he does Victor of Tunnuna, Prosper, and Eusebius-Jerome. Although one can divine a clear historical argument in John's work — the rise of a Visigothic monarchy under Leovigild and its subsequent conversion to orthodoxy — in other respects he remains directly in the tradition of his predecessors, struggling like Hydatius before him to fill an empire-wide canvas from an irrevocably peripheral location. Like Victor of Tunnuna, whose chronicle he continued, John also struggled to cope with the collapse of the universal consular dating system, which had been the norm for so many years. No one continued John. Despite a vibrant seventh-century literary culture, probably the most accomplished in the Latin world of the period, Visigothic Spain produced no more chronicles until after the Arab conquest.<sup>5</sup> Instead, we have Isidore's new chronicle epitome, the most popular of his various historical works.

Isidore was born around 560, the brother of another churchman and prolific author, Leander, and acceded to the episcopate of Seville around 600, serving as bishop until his death in 636.<sup>6</sup> While he lived he was the most important churchman in Spain, deeply involved in the politics of the kingdom, and certainly the most prolific writer of the early medieval West before Bede. Isidore wrote a great deal besides history, so much so that he receives his own long chapter in each edition of the standard bibliography of Visigothic Spain.<sup>7</sup> Understanding these works is complicated by the fact that very nearly everything Isidore wrote, including every one

<sup>5</sup> The best introduction to the culture of the seventh-century kingdom is Fontaine and Pellistrandi 1992.

<sup>6</sup> In general, see Fontaine 2000.

<sup>7</sup> Ferreiro 1988, 2006, and 2008.

of his historical works, exists in multiple recensions, many of them made within a few decades of his death and thus harder to distinguish from authorial composition than are the more obviously late interpolations.<sup>8</sup> Like Cassiodorus in the previous century, Isidore devoted himself to compiling information into readily useable forms, and his historical and biographical works are very much works of compilation. Isidore made a point of keeping on good terms with the Gothic monarchs in Toledo, and many of his early writings seem to have been a product of his close relationship with the literarily inclined ruler Sisebut (612–20/21) who directly inspired the *De rerum naturae* and the *Origines siue Etymologiae*, both great medieval textbooks.<sup>9</sup> We cannot be certain that Isidore's historical works shared the same royal patronage, but their relative chronology is fairly well established.

The earliest of these works was the so-called *Chronica*, the first edition of which was composed around 615. As we shall see, this differed in important ways from its Hieronymian model, but the work that Isidore composed shortly thereafter, the *De uiris illustribus*, was much more closely modelled on Jerome's work of the same title and on its Gallic continuation by Gennadius of Marseille. Whereas Gennadius's work took in much of the fifth century, Isidore's *De uiris* celebrated the great western authors of the sixth and earlier seventh centuries, with a patriotic emphasis on Spain. Isidore's text was continued in turn by Ildefonsus of Toledo, and then by a further anonymous writer, before in the twelfth century inspiring a work of the same title by that very Sigebert of Gembloux with whom we shall conclude our study.<sup>10</sup> Taken as a whole, the Spanish sequence of works collectively entitled *De uiris illustribus* forms a remarkably complete catalogue of the intellectual life of Visigothic Spain and still provides the foundation for prosopographies of the period. Some time after the *De uiris*, Isidore composed his *Historia Gothorum Wandalorum Sueuorum*. This epitome history or *breviarium* has some of the characteristics of an ancient chronicle, but survives in long and short versions that stand in a very uncertain relationship to one another. Isidore's final original historical work — what he included in the *Etymologiae* was an epitome of his already existing epitomes — was a second, much expanded version of the *Chronica*. This

<sup>8</sup> The *Etymologiae* is the clearest-cut example: see Porzig 1937 and Reydellet 1966.

<sup>9</sup> Fontaine 1960.

<sup>10</sup> See Codoñer Merino 1964, Codoñer Merino 1972, Schulz 1910, and Witte 1974. As Sigebert explains, 'Imitatus etiam Hieronymum et Gennadium scripsi ultimum hunc libellum de illustribus uiris, quantum notitia meae inuestigationis exquirere potui' ('In imitation of both Jerome and Gennadius I have written this last book, *On Famous Men*, as far as the results of my research have allowed me'; *De uiris illustribus*, 171).



appeared in 626, in the reign of Suinthila (r. 621–31) who had overthrown Sisebut's young heir Reccared II (r. 621).

We need say no more about the *De uiris illustribus*, a series of brief biographies without a historical structure, let alone narrative. By contrast, Isidore's *Historia Gothorum Wandalorum Sueuorum* requires some attention. Although often spoken of as a chronicle, and indeed edited in vol. II of Mommsen's *Chronica minora* series and translated into English in a volume of Spanish chronicles, it is a really an epitome history on the model of the late Roman *breviaria*, like Eutropius and Aurelius Victor, rather than a chronicle.<sup>11</sup> In fact, consideration of the *Historia* may usefully underscore the difference between chronicle and epitome history. The *Historia* is extant in two different versions, short and long, with no overlap in their manuscript traditions. Neither version obviously or demonstrably derives from the other, as becomes clear when the two are presented side by side.<sup>12</sup> That is to say, the short version is not an abridgement of the long version, but neither is the long version an expansion of the short in the way that the long version of Isidore's *Chronica* is clearly an authorial expansion of the short version.<sup>13</sup> The long version of the *Historia* survives in much older, and many more, manuscripts than does the short version, which is represented by one twelfth-century manuscript and two copies that depend upon it.<sup>14</sup> There are, by contrast, ten more or less complete copies of the long version as well as six fragments, many of them from the ninth and tenth centuries.<sup>15</sup> The short version lacks a preface and includes neither the so-called *Laus Hispaniae* nor the *recapitulatio* that, respectively, precede and follow the long version. As extant, the short version ends with the death of King Sisebut in 620/21, incorrectly calculated as era 666, whereas the long version carries on to the fifth

<sup>11</sup> See Wolf 1999 for a translation.

<sup>12</sup> As they are in the critical edition of Rodríguez Alonso 1975, which retains Mommsen's manuscript sigla and should be used in preference to Mommsen's edition in Mommsen 1894: 241–303. The latter obscures differences between the two versions and is typographically confusing (as is so often the case with Mommsen's *Chron. min.* editions), though it remains essential for the various *additamenta*. Note that Rodríguez's otherwise fine edition contains one serious typographical error: in the *conspectus siglorum*, p. 165, the headings of the lists of manuscripts of the *uersio longa* and the *uersio brevis* are reversed.

<sup>13</sup> The main divergences are shown by R. Collins 1994.

<sup>14</sup> Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, MS lat. 4873, with a direct copy in Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, MS lat. 6815 and an indirect copy in Madrid, Biblioteca nacional, MS 8696. See Rodríguez Alonso 1975: 137–38.

<sup>15</sup> Rodríguez Alonso 1975: 123–37.

year of Suinthila, with praise of whom it concludes in the year 625/26. Another barely altered edition of the long version must be postulated, since a version with a dedication to King Sisenand, who succeeded Suinthila in 631, is also extant.<sup>16</sup>

The foregoing is undisputed, but the difficulty of relating the short to the long version remains. This can be solved neither by postulating two different Isidoran versions, nor by invoking the revisions of a later Visigothic redactor, though that latter model does explain the transmission of the *De uiris*.<sup>17</sup> Mommsen believed that no authentically Isidoran version survived at all, but rather that both long and short versions were later modifications of a single original composed by Isidore. An alternative solution may be to identify the short version as the work of a different author altogether, Maximus of Zaragoza, who is known to have written a *historiola*.<sup>18</sup> Maximus was Bishop of Zaragoza at the end of the sixth and the beginning of the seventh century and the predecessor of Bishop John. John was the elder brother of Isidore's disciple Braulio who, after Isidore's death, compiled a *Renotatio librorum* of his works, which remains essential to historians and philologists.<sup>19</sup> Isidore does Maximus the honour of placing him last in the *De uiris* and very specifically praises his *historiola*, admitting that it is the only one of Maximus's works that he has read.<sup>20</sup> Though Maximus was once identified as the author of what Mommsen called the *Chronica Caesaraugustana*, that text has now, quite correctly, been shorn of its status as a separate chronicle — as we saw in the last chapter, it is really no more than a series of marginal annotations to Victor of Tunnuna and John of Bictar, drawn from an anonymous consularia source of the sixth century.<sup>21</sup>

<sup>16</sup> Madrid, Biblioteca de la Universidad Complutense, MS 134. The version of the *Historia* used by Lucas of Tuy in the thirteenth century also contained this dedication (Rodríguez Alonso 1975: 134–35).

<sup>17</sup> Following the lead of Hertzberg (1874), Rodríguez Alonso (1975: 26–56) favours authorial revision, against Mommsen (1894: 254–56). Cf. R. Collins 1994.

<sup>18</sup> R. Collins 1994.

<sup>19</sup> For the *Renotatio*, see Martín 2006: 11–274, with the edition at 193–207.

<sup>20</sup> Isidore, *De uiris illustribus*, 33 (ed. by Codoñer Merino 1964: 153): 'Maximus, Caesaraugustanae urbis episcopus, multa uersu prosaque componere dicitur. Scripsit et breui stilo historiolum de iis quae temporibus Gothorum in Hispaniis acta sunt, historico et composito sermone. Sed et multa alia scribere dicitur, quae necdum legi' ('Maximus, bishop of Zaragoza, is said to have written a great deal in verse and prose. He also wrote a little history in brief compass concerning those things which had been done in the Spains during the time of the Goths, in a historical and ordered language. But he is also said to have written many other things, which I have not yet read').

<sup>21</sup> Mommsen 1894: 221–23, but see now Cardelle de Hartmann 2001.

While it is possible that Maximus's *historiola* does not survive, it might well in fact be the short version of the *Historia Gothorum*. What we know of Isidore's scissors-and-paste compositional method renders this notion plausible and helps to explain the very real ideological differences between the two texts (only the short version, for instance, has anything to say about the adoption of Byzantine-styled regalia by Leovigild). All Isidore's works are monuments of research, but little in any of them represents original composition. That is to say that, like Eusebius, Isidore was usually content to provide linking passages between large chunks of borrowed material. The short version of the *Historia Gothorum* may, therefore, be a lightly retouched version of Maximus of Zaragoza's *historiola*, made topical by attaching a note on the death of Sisebut, who was still alive when Maximus died.<sup>22</sup>

The most important point in the present context, however, is that regardless of authorship, both the long and short versions of the *Historia Gothorum* are epitome histories on the model of Eutropius, Aurelius Victor, or the later Paul the Deacon rather than chronicles.<sup>23</sup> That is to say, they set out to relate a coherent narrative on a single theme, in this case the history of the Goths from the beginning: the long version is entitled *De origine Gothorum*, while the acephalous short version begins 'Gothorum antiquissimum esse regnum certum est, quod ex regno Scytharum est exortum' ('The kingdom of the Goths, which arose from the kingdom of the Scythians, is certainly of the greatest antiquity'), making its purpose quite clear. From sketchy origins, both versions of the *Historia* become reign-by-reign accounts of Gothic history from the time of Alaric I; the model of a late Roman *breviarium* could not be clearer. What has confused matters, and led many commentators to treat the *Historia* as if it were a chronicle, is the precision of the chronographic apparatus. But the *Historia* is not annalistic. Isidore's sources were too few to give a year-by-year account of Gothic history: he drew on Jerome, Orosius, Prosper, and Hydatius, probably a common source shared with the *Consularia Caesaraugustana* and the *Gallic Chronicle of 511*, John of Biclar, and the first version of his own *Chronica*. As modern scholars themselves soon discover, one cannot write annalistic Gothic history from the available sources. Isidore gets as close to that approach as he can: each Gothic accession is synchronized to the universal chronologies of

<sup>22</sup> Maximus's successor John acceded to the episcopal throne while Sisebut reigned: see Ildefonsus of Toledo, *De uiris illustribus*, 5 (Codoñer Merino 1972: 122–24).

<sup>23</sup> Hillgarth (1970: 295) denies the existence of any model for the *Historia*, but an epitome history is a common enough genre whether it pertains to Romans, Goths, or any other group; the *Historia* is a very straightforward historical epitome or *breviarium*; and we know from the two editions of his chronicle that Isidore had read Eutropius (see below).

the Spanish era and imperial regnal years and, where his sources allow, Isidore signals relative chronology within a Gothic king's reign. These synchronisms at the start of each reign have misled casual observers into classifying the *Historia* as a chronicle, since the use of the Spanish era in particular looks very much like the sort of universal chronology one finds structuring chronicles. The narrative of the *Historia*, however, advances by epitomizing the events of each successive king's reign, which is to say, in the manner of a *breviarium* like Paul's, without supplying an annalistic chronological frame within the reign. The synchronizations at the start of each reign must derive from a chronicle — in fact, from the tabulations in Isidore's own *Chronica* — as some such running synchronization was needed in order to correlate the starting dates of Gothic reigns with imperial regnal years and era dates. But in and of itself, it is the epitomized narrative rather than the chronographic structure that shapes the text of the *Historia*. The chronographic material is only employed by Isidore to give his epitome history greater precision; it does not provide its structure. This is very much the structure of the *Chronica* as well, which explains our terminology for it, though the latter work is much more epitomized. The key point here is that the chronological markers simply indicate the dates of key moments in Gothic history and, from Alaric, the accession of each new Gothic king. They date only that first sentence or accession, not all the events narrated down to the next set of markers, as would be the case in a chronicle. Remove the markers and nothing fundamental is lost; we still have, particularly from the accession of Alaric, an epitome history exactly like Eutropius: a list of kings (or emperors) with a summary account of the events of that reign. Paul the Deacon, for instance, includes frequent years AUC and *ab incarnatione domini*, yet he wrote a continuation of Eutropius not a chronicle. In a chronicle, by contrast, the chronographic superstructure controls what narrative structure there is and exactly dates each event narrated. Remove the chronology and one is left with a very different sort of work indeed. In both long and short versions of the *Historia*, the synchronisms and the chronographic apparatus are fully subordinate to the epitomized narrative. As we saw in Chapter 1 the presence of a chronology does not make a work a chronicle. It was simply a case of the influence of the chronicle genre's prompting a wider interest in chronology.

To further illustrate the difference, we can turn to Isidore's *Chronica*, which is much the most innovative of his works.<sup>24</sup> That fact might seem surprising, given that the *Chronica* is heavily dependent upon Eusebius-Jerome and other forerunners

<sup>24</sup> Wattenbach and others 1952–90: I, 86–88. See now Wood 2007.

and contains very little original prose at all. What Isidore does to his forerunners, however, is of considerable interest and was of lasting historiographical importance. In his *Renotatio*, Braulio of Zaragoza lists the chronicle with the following description: 'Chronicorum a principio mundi usque ad tempus suum librum unum, nimia breuitate collectum' ('One book of chronicles from the beginning of the world to his time, compiled with extreme brevity').<sup>25</sup> As we have it, this *Chronica* survives in two versions, one longer and one shorter, the former a substantial amplification of the latter. Isidore also included a heavily compressed epitome of the later, longer version of the chronicle in book five of his *Etymologiae*. The first edition ended in 615/16 with a peroration in praise of Sisebut that is likewise preserved in the second edition, which ends in 626 with praise of Suinthila.<sup>26</sup> Roughly a quarter of the text of the long version is made up of additions to the short version, about ninety entries in total out of 418, and just over a handful were removed from the earlier edition. Isidore seems to have discovered, or decided to use, certain new sources between the composition of the short and long versions; for instance, John of Biclar was completely unknown to the short version and Eutropius barely used in it, whereas both were prominently mined for the long version.<sup>27</sup>

Ideologically, Isidore's *Chronica* is rather more Byzantine and medieval than its Eusebian predecessor, not altogether surprisingly given the adoption of eastern Roman ceremonial customs visible throughout Visigothic Spain from the 570s onwards.<sup>28</sup> Throughout the *Chronica*, there is an emphasis on the majesty of the ruler and the necessity of obedience to him, in part drawn from the fifth-century ecclesiastical historians by way of Cassiodorus's *Historia Tripartita*.<sup>29</sup> The novelty lies in Isidore's explicit desire to sum up history in an abbreviated fashion, a *temporum summa*.<sup>30</sup> To do this, and wholly originally, he imports into chronographic writing Augustine's theory of the six ages of the world, which had first been articulated in the *De ciuitate dei*. These six ages, more than any other structuring schema, could chart the progress of human history through the time of God's creation — they were, that is to say, more visibly evocative of divine planning than was the

<sup>25</sup> Martín 2006: 13\*.

<sup>26</sup> Martín 2003: 15\*–16\*.

<sup>27</sup> R. Collins 1994: 354, though there are, in fact, four citations from Eutropius in the short version: Martín 2003: 28\* n. 26.

<sup>28</sup> Hillgarth 1966.

<sup>29</sup> Hillgarth 1970: 277–79.

<sup>30</sup> Isidore, *Chronica*, 2.

succession of human empires that had structured the work of Eusebius-Jerome.<sup>31</sup> By structuring his historical material very briefly and according to Augustine's six ages, Isidore created the chronicle epitome. Rather than using Eusebius-Jerome as a base to be continued and/or supplemented with a new beginning to cover time between Creation and Abraham, Isidore began compiling a whole new chronicle as an integral work. It would not have the same level of detail or the same annalistic richness as did the many works based on Eusebius-Jerome, but it would cover rather more time in dramatically less space, while avoiding the feeling of cobbled-together *disiecta membra* that usually affected such composite works.

This chronology of the six ages of the world is fully incorporated into the working out of the text of the second edition: after the six days of Creation, there follows the first age, which lasts till the time of Noah; the second age follows, from Noah to Abraham; the third age runs from Abraham to David; the fourth from David to the Babylonian Captivity; the fifth from the Captivity to the time of Augustus; and the sixth and final age, which is still in progress and will of course conclude with the end times, in practice runs down to the end point of the chronicle, the reign of Suinthila. Both editions begin with Creation and are structured by the presence of the *anni mundi*, originally marking the time from the creation of the world to the entry marking the birth of each of the patriarchs (except Adam), but then dating the final year of each judge, king, or emperor's reign, even though they are placed next to their accession entries. Not every year is recorded, and the first four ages of the world fly past very rapidly, but whenever ages (for patriarchs) or regnal years are noted in the text, the marginal *annus mundi* dating apparatus is accurately applied. By contrast, the fifth age contains over a third of the number of entries in the first four ages, while the sixth age takes up just under half the entries of the entire chronicle. The level of annalistic detail is enormously reduced and the horror vacui that characterized the Latin chronicle tradition from its beginnings is no longer felt in Isidore's work. Instead, time is portrayed in a linear fashion but recorded in stages, rather than year by year. In contrast to the complicated columnar approach of Eusebius-Jerome, moreover, Isidore's linear structure shows time moving along a single axis, rather than the multiple axes of the early sections of Eusebius-Jerome where different kingdoms, different geographical spaces, run on parallel tracks down the axis of time.

<sup>31</sup> Reydellet 1970.

Despite the novelty of construction, the materials from which Isidore constructed his chronicle are extremely familiar.<sup>32</sup> Eusebius-Jerome is by far the largest source for the periods it covered, but it is supplemented by the *breviarium* of Festus and, particularly in the long version, the *breviarium* of Eutropius. After Eusebius-Jerome runs out, Jerome's continuators become the main sources, first Prosper, then Victor of Tunnuna and John of Biclar. Hydatius is used, but very sparingly, which is in stark contrast to the substantial use Isidore makes of him in the *Historia Gothorum* (wherein the Vandal and Suevic histories are essentially pure Hydatius). For ecclesiastical history, Rufinus's Latin translation of Eusebius's *Historia ecclesiastica* and the *Historia Tripartita* of Cassiodorus are mined. To these, passages are added from a large number of other works, notably Augustine, particularly the *De ciuitate dei*, and Jerome, particularly the *De uiris illustribus*, as well as Isidore's own *De ortu et obitu patrum*. As noted above, the changes to the second, long version are almost entirely a matter of amplification. There are few traces of revision along ideological lines, although it is possible that the suppression of the record of Leovigild's campaigns in the long version was out of deference to Suinthila who had, in 624, ejected the Byzantines from the Iberian peninsula and thereby seemingly surpassed Leovigild's achievement.

### Iberian Chronicles after Isidore

With the death of Isidore, chronicles ceased to be compiled in Visigothic Spain, though historiographical production as such did not stop. Julian of Toledo's *Historia Wambae* is an almost Sallustian monograph on the campaign of King Wamba to suppress the usurpation of the Narbonensian rebel Paul.<sup>33</sup> Yet despite that lone exception, the political history of seventh-century Spain remains deeply obscure to modern scholars chiefly because Isidore found no successor in the historical field. Biographies, law codes, conciliar acts, hagiographies we have in quantity. Historical and chronographic literature are absent. They reappear, however, in the aftermath of the Muslim invasion of 711, which took many years to produce a real cultural break in southern Spain. The so-called Mozarabic literature of the eighth and ninth centuries flourished very much in the mode of its seventh-century

<sup>32</sup> Most of these are already shown in Mommsen's marginal apparatus, which he based largely on the conclusions of Hertzberg 1874, but the survey in Martín 2003: 25\*–35\* and 214–32 is complete.

<sup>33</sup> See the study of Pizarro 2005.

Visigothic predecessor, and only in the tenth century was southern culture more thoroughly Islamicized.<sup>34</sup> A cultural break in Spanish historiography came somewhat earlier in the north of the peninsula, which fell under Carolingian cultural influence from the later eighth century onwards, so that the so-called Asturian chronicles are very much in the mode of high-Carolingian Frankish chronicles.<sup>35</sup> We shall consider those in the context of the Carolingian world, but here something can be said of Mozarabic historiography under Muslim rule.

Two Mozarabic works in particular stand out for their historical importance, both surviving only because they were inserted into compendious manuscripts that preserved Jerome, Prosper, Victor, and John.<sup>36</sup> The first of these is the so-called *Byzantino-Arabic Chronicle*, or more helpfully, the *Chronicle of 741*, while the more important, and much more controversial, is the *Chronicle of 754*. The *Chronicle of 741* is a continuation of John of Biclar, which comes as something of a surprise, not so much because of the chronological distance between the two works — John ends in 589 — but because of the model of Isidore's *Historia Gothorum* that looms in between.<sup>37</sup> In spite of the obvious and voluminous late antique chronicle model that lay before the author in the works of Eusebius-Jerome-Prosper-Victor-John which he continued, his actual historical inspiration came not from them but from Isidore's *Historia*. He therefore wrote a *breviarium* with chronological lemmata noting the beginnings of reigns, rather than a chronicle, despite the fact that this *breviarium* continued a whole string of actual chronicles.<sup>38</sup> At the start, the author uses a chronographic framework based on the Spanish era, derived from Isidore's *Historia* and marking Gothic and Byzantine accession years and regnal terms, and retains this to the accession of Sisebut when the Isidorian chronology runs out. He thereafter follows imperial and caliphal regnal years, without bothering to continue the Spanish era chronology. But through it all it is clear that the work that exerts

<sup>34</sup> There is a comprehensive compilation of the primary sources, indifferently edited, in Gil 1973.

<sup>35</sup> See pp. 250–53 below.

<sup>36</sup> Díaz y Díaz 1963, with Mommsen 1894: 165–75 and 329–33, and Cardelle de Hartmann 2001: 13\*–45\*.

<sup>37</sup> Edited in Mommsen 1894: 334–59. See also Dubler 1946.

<sup>38</sup> The same is true of the last part of the *Hafniensis* compilation, which begins with Eusebius-Jerome-Prosper to 455, then consularia down to 493 (some of which were interpolated back into Prosper), lightly annotated fasti between 494 and 523, and finally a short *breviarium* from 526 to 619, with a concluding sentence in section 24 bringing the narrative down to 626 and an interpolated date of 640/41 in section 18 (a text Mommsen calls the 'auctuarii Havniensis extrema': Mommsen 1892: 331, 33, 337–39). For more details on this text, see Volume II.



the greatest influence on it is Isidore's *Historia Gothorum*. In terms of its content, what makes the text of the *Chronicle of 741* so interesting is the absence of any discernible Spanish focus, whether Gothic or Hispano-Roman. Its main interest is in Byzantine and Muslim affairs, and it appears to draw on Greek sources from the eastern empire in order to compile its narrative: material common to Theophanes and the *Ἱστορία σύντομος* of Nicephorus is clearly among the Mozarabic historian's sources.

Unlike the *Chronicle of 741*, the *Chronicle of 754* knew both John of Biclar and Isidore's chronicles, and both of them had a highly visible impact on his text. Because its dating method takes in the Spanish era, *anni mundi*, and a synchronism of emperors, Muslim kings, and Gothic kings, its chronological apparatus is cluttered and cumbersome, not to mention frequently incorrect. And yet because of that apparatus, the *Chronicle of 754* is one of the most ambitious chronographic works in Latin of the early Middle Ages and the one closest to late antique models of chronicle composition, with its concern for original research and the precise synchronisms of different human empires.<sup>39</sup> It is no more a chronicle, however, than the *Chronicle of 741*.

It is, though, the last work in the Iberian peninsula, indeed in the Latin West, that stands in a relatively direct relation to the ancient chronicle tradition, in the same way that the *Chronicon Paschale* and Theophanes do in the East. But while Theophanes was simultaneously the last ancient Greek chronicler and the founder of a new Byzantine tradition of annalistic universal history, the *Chronicle of 754* was something of a dead end. It was never continued, and the Latin historiographical tradition thereafter died out among the Mozarabic population of southern Spain. The Christian Latin historiography of the Asturian kingdoms, when the chronicle genre was revived there, fell fully within the Carolingian, Frankish tradition. We shall consider those Asturian chronicles briefly later in this chapter, but we can next turn to the British Isles, where the Isidoran tradition had a profound impact.

<sup>39</sup> Stylistically, the almost too-frequent use of 'Huius temporibus' ('During his reign') and similar such phrases as a linking device derives directly from the second edition of Isidore's *Chronica*, while the author's synchronisms of dating systems, at least in the form in which he presents them, are something quite new: e.g. 'Huius temporibus, in era DCLXXX, anno imperii Constantini primo, Arabum XXV, regnante in eis Atthuman anno secundo, Chindasuinthus per tirannidem regnum Gothorum inuasum Yberie triumphabiliter principat, demoliens Gothos, sexque per annos' ('During his reign, in Era 680, in the first year of the reign of Constantine, the twenty-fifth year of the Arabs among whom Uthman was reigning in his second year, Chindasvint seized the Iberian kingdom of the Goths by usurpation and ruled in triumph — all the while destroying Goths — and for six years'; Mommsen 1894: 341, section 26).

## Bede and Anglo-Saxon England

Where the first chronicle produced in the British Isles was actually written is not altogether clear. The earliest British historical work is the *De excidio Britanniae* of the monk Gildas, a strange, polemical work that — despite having been edited by Mommsen in the third volume of the *Chronica minora* — is neither a chronicle nor even really an epitome history, but which does clearly demonstrate how shallow and uncertain a historical vision of the past was available to the British of the late fifth and sixth centuries.<sup>40</sup> Bede is, without any question, the most significant Latin author between the fall of the western empire and the eleventh century. His *Historia ecclesiastica* casts a very long shadow over English history writing from his own day to well after the Norman Conquest, when a new Anglo-Norman vision of English history was created in the works of William of Malmesbury and Geoffrey of Monmouth.<sup>41</sup> But like Gregory of Tours's *Historiae* in Francia, Bede's ecclesiastical history is effectively an *unicum*. Gregory wrote what he took to be a classicizing narrative history (however hard its classical elements may be for the modern scholar to spot), while Bede wrote a full-blown ecclesiastical narrative in a manner that had not been attempted since Cassiodorus assembled the *Historia Tripartita* out of its original Greek elements in the sixth century. And that was only the second full-blown narrative ecclesiastical history after Rufinus's translation and continuation of Eusebius's at the beginning of the fifth century.

While interest in, and analysis of, Bede's exegetical works has come back into fashion in recent years, not least through a proliferation of scholarly translations of his most important commentaries, discussion of Bede's historical importance still tends to rest on the *Historia*. Influential as that was, however, his chronicles were even further reaching in their importance.<sup>42</sup> Like Cassiodorus and Isidore before him, Bede had a profound interest in creating a useable framework of knowledge, one that could be used to teach God's message and to teach it correctly. The didactic nature of his works, not least those on measuring time, is impossible to miss, for to understand time and number is to learn God's plan for the world.<sup>43</sup>

<sup>40</sup> Gildas is edited along with the eighth-century epitome history of Nennius in Mommsen 1898: 1–85, 111–201, but the editions in Winterbottom 1978 and Morris 1978 are more convenient and, for Nennius, much superior.

<sup>41</sup> See Brooke 1970 for a survey and Hanning 1966 for an interpretation that remains persuasive.

<sup>42</sup> Although we do not discuss it here, it should be pointed out that the first part of Bede's 'recapitulatio' of the entire work (*HE*, 5. 24) is in essence a short chronicle epitome as well.

<sup>43</sup> Wallis 1999: xxiv–xxix.

That said, however, Bede's didacticism was also polemical, for unlike his predecessors in Italy and Spain, Bede was faced with a controversy over calculating the date of Easter that had long made reconciliation of English and Celtic churches impossible and had only been resolved at the synod of Whitby in 664 (though universal acceptance of its verdict did not occur until 716). Bede himself supported the 532-year Easter cycle popularized by Dionysius Exiguus against the various alternative Easter cycles on offer. Bede wrote two works *De temporibus*, one short, one long, which modern scholars distinguish by referring to the longer one conventionally as *De temporum ratione*.<sup>44</sup>

The first, shorter *De temporibus* appeared in 703, and it was a work of pure didacticism, explaining the elements that go into understanding time (moments and hours, days, nights, weeks, months, solstice and equinox, years, bissextile years), moving from there to the question of dating Easter, and concluding with a very short exposition of the six ages of the world, which was based on Isidore's greatly reduced chronicle epitome from the *Etymologiae*.<sup>45</sup> This last chapter got Bede into trouble, for by placing the Incarnation at *annus mundi* 3952 (following the Vulgate chronology for Adam to Abraham from Jerome's translation of the Hebrew Old Testament), rather than the conventional Isidoran 5199 (derived via Eusebius-Jerome from the Greek Septuagint translation), Bede laid himself open to a charge of heresy. Of course, neither side knew that in the East it had been determined that Christ had been born in the year 5500 or 5508 (to name the most common of the variants). Bede responded sharply in 708 with his *Epistula ad Pleguinam de aetatibus saeculi*, in which he rather condescendingly explained how his enemies had misunderstood the lengths of each of the six ages.<sup>46</sup> That was only the opening gambit in a full-scale justification of his chronology, which appeared in 725 as his second major work *de temporibus*, the one we call *De temporum ratione*.<sup>47</sup> This was a massive work, designed to form an expanded explanation of all the elements of time already treated in *De temporibus* and to use them as a preface for the most

<sup>44</sup> These are edited in Jones 1943, to which edition we here refer, reprinted in CCSL, 123C (*De temporibus*) and CCSL, 123B (*De ratione temporum*), though note that only the CCSL editions include the chapters with the chronicles, both from Mommsen 1898.

<sup>45</sup> Ed. in Jones 1943: 293–303.

<sup>46</sup> Ed. in Jones 1943: 305–15.

<sup>47</sup> Ed. in Jones 1943: 173–291, and English translation and commentary in Wallis 1999.

novel part of the *De temporum ratione*, the large chronicle epitome that makes up its chapter sixty-six.<sup>48</sup>

Although, as with any work of this type, Eusebius-Jerome lay at the back of Bede's work, its real predecessor was the *Chronica* of Isidore, in its original and epitomized versions. Bede's chronicle epitome is just as radically abbreviated as Isidore's, although it has a somewhat more even balance between biblical and post-biblical history. As in Isidore, it is the *anni mundi* that provide the structural framework, but Bede uses an *annus mundi* calculation that ends up dating the Incarnation not to Isidore's AM 5199, but rather to AM 3952. This again represented a rejection of the exclusively Septuagint chronology taken over by Isidore from Eusebius-Jerome and an acceptance of the chronology of Jerome's translation of the Old Testament from the Hebrew, but one that is fully in keeping with Bede's implied insistence upon learning how one goes about correctly calculating the passage of time. It was also a very explicit repudiation of those who had criticized his brief explanation of the redating in the *De temporibus*. Yet despite that, Bede's sources in *De temporum ratione* 66 are largely conventional: he relied fundamentally on Jerome, Isidore, Orosius, Marcellinus *comes*, and the *Liber pontificalis*, his sole source from the reign of Heraclius onwards, as well as Augustine's *De ciuitate dei*, the Vulgate, Josephus's *Jewish Antiquities* (in a Latin translation), Jerome's *Commentarii in Daniele*, Eutropius, Hegesippus (the Latin translation of Josephus's *Jewish War*), Rufinus's translation of Eusebius's *Historia ecclesiastica*, Prosper, and Gildas. A distinctly insular perspective is provided by occasional reliance upon British predecessors like Gildas, and authors with special cachet in Britain like Gregory the Great. It was the historical vision, which far more even than Isidore was detached from a Roman, imperial, or ancient perspective, that may have given Bede's chronicle such influence on future chronicling in the medieval west. Whereas Isidore's chronicle, for all its innovation of structure, was essentially still a work whose late Roman content was unavoidable, in Bede's account one could not only grasp the span of world history *uno in conspectu*, but also do so in a Christian perspective that was not dominated by the overwhelming fact of Rome and its empire. Bede's world was vastly more Christian than it was Roman. That was a fundamental change, and it made his framework infinitely adaptable to a Latin Europe in which no power, not even the Carolingians with their hyperbolic ideology of empire, could re-create the unavoidable centrality of Rome and her

<sup>48</sup> Mommsen 1898: 223–333. The chronicle, *De temporum ratione* 66, was not edited by Jones 1943, which was not entirely inappropriate given its long history of circulating separately from the rest of the treatise.

emperors. Eusebius and those who followed him had found it necessary to turn Roman history into Christian time, because Roman history in their age *was* history itself. For Bede, history was Christian, and Rome's emperors were just one more defunct set of secular rulers in a sea of Christian time. Given that, and despite the fact that his *anni mundi* were soon replaced by the *annus domini* system which he himself used in his ecclesiastical history, it should come as no surprise that Bede's chronicle should have been the central plank in Latin chronicling and historiography for centuries to come.

If Bede had an exceptional impact upon the future by way of a historical work that sometimes replaced, and always supplemented, earlier chronicles as a source for later medieval writers, there is another strand of Anglo-Saxon historiography and chronography that we need to consider here, if only very briefly. Perhaps the most interesting and distinctive element of English historiography is the respectability of the vernacular as a vehicle for serious writing. Old English, with the impetus given in particular by King Alfred's translations and his educational efforts, was a vehicle for communicating complex ideas and prestigious subjects in a way that no other vernacular would match until the fourteenth or fifteenth century; indeed English and Irish were the only vernaculars in use for historical subjects in western Europe before the thirteenth century. This precocity of the vernacular in England makes for its rather peculiar historiographical profile. The *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* is, of course, the most famous and significant historical production in the vernacular, perhaps leaving aside Alfred's own translation of Orosius.<sup>49</sup> The chronicle survives in seven manuscripts, of four more or less distinct versions, along with other fragments, all of which featured continuations and interpolations and one of which continued to be compiled down to 1154.<sup>50</sup> In the *Parker Chronicle* (Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 173), one can actually watch the changing of hands as contemporary compilers add new entries to the original ninth-century manuscript; in every other manuscript, including the main alternative version (the *Laud* or *Peterborough Chronicle*, Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Laud 636), we have copies of the tenth and later centuries, so that continuations become visible only relatively late in the history of compilation. The original impetus for the *Parker Chronicle* certainly came from Alfred's kingdom of Wessex, though few would now ascribe it directly to Alfred himself. The Wessex perspective of the chronicle is

<sup>49</sup> Plummer 1899 is the most accessible edition, but the translation in Garmonsway 1953 provides most of what a non-specialist will want.

<sup>50</sup> Plummer 1899: II, xxiii–ciii.

quite clear, though perhaps not that of the kingdom's centre in Hampshire. Different versions interpolate information on other Anglo-Saxon kingdoms, some of it retrospectively with the use of Bede. The content of all the versions of the chronicle, however, is much the same as that of ancient chronicles, in fact quite strikingly so: the style is paratactic; no narrative thrust is explicit, although the reader can infer the centrality of Wessex to the chroniclers' historical imagination; and the annalistic format is rigidly observed whether or not there is material to be recorded. The matters treated, too, should be familiar to readers of this volume: wars, meteorological and celestial phenomena, the successions of bishops, abbots, and princes, and the political events accessible to the author at the place of compilation. The *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* had a powerful influence on other historical works written in English, on both sides of the Conquest. Many items that first appear in the *Chronicle*, for instance, are incorporated in a Latin translation into Asser's *Life of Alfred*, quite fittingly so if those who see Alfred's guiding hand behind the compilation are correct.<sup>51</sup> Well after the Conquest, the *Chronicle* continued to be updated and also translated into Latin.<sup>52</sup> It serves as a useful reminder that, just as contemporary chronicling could exist in eastern vernaculars, so in one small corner of Latin Europe, the old tradition of contemporary annalistic compilation remained strong. For all that, the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* never had the sort of impact outside the Anglo-Saxon world that Bede's chronicles did. In two very different parts of the early medieval world, Ireland and Francia, Bede's works had an immediate and revolutionary impact. We shall take Ireland first.

## Chronicles in Ireland

A large number of chronicles — what the specialist literature calls Irish annals — are extant from early medieval Ireland. Most of them include what appear to be fossils of great age, but every last chronicle that now survives is a product of the late Middle Ages or, indeed, the early modern period, Ireland being one of the few regions in which a line of unbroken, intermittently contemporary chronicling

<sup>51</sup> There seems no point in entering into the controversy over the authenticity of Asser's life, though suffice to say that the arguments of Galbraith 1964, revived in Smyth 1995 and 2002, seem to us to have long since been answered satisfactorily in Stevenson and Whitelock 1959 and Whitelock 1968.

<sup>52</sup> London, British Library, MS Cotton Domitian A VIII, for instance, is a bilingual epitome of the larger chronicle made at Christ Church, Canterbury.

survives into the early seventeenth century.<sup>53</sup> This has created a very particular set of problems for the study of early Irish history and historiography. It is not just that almost all our manuscripts are so late, something that is true of any number of ancient texts; it is that these manuscripts do not merely offer a late copy of an old text, but rather stand at the end of a continuous process of epitomization and interpolation that makes the normal processes of textual criticism virtually impossible. What is more, many of the most important Irish chronicles are not available in critical editions.<sup>54</sup> To make matters still worse, most scholarly discussion of early Irish historiography has taken place in profound isolation, with very little consideration of evidence from, or advances in, late antique and early medieval studies more generally, simply long and divisive debates among specialists. As with all relatively insular fields, there is a risk that newcomers will misunderstand the scale and scope of specialist arguments, but there is simultaneously the potential for wholly new light to be shone on petrified debate. Since one of the present book's authors is preparing a monograph on the textual relationships among the Irish chronicles for the period prior to 700, we shall here present only the state of the extant evidence for Irish chronicles, and the still provisional conclusions of Burgess's forthcoming study, which may end up looking somewhat different in the end.

For the general purposes of this volume, it seemed essential to include the Irish chronicles despite their many difficulties, both to counter the habit of viewing Ireland as totally separate from the rest of the medieval world and also as a useful illustration of how the chronicle genre made its transition to the Middle Ages and, indeed, beyond. Ireland had no native historiographical tradition of its own, unless one includes the oral history and legend that ultimately produced the epic *Táin*, and it also had no Roman past of even the most vestigial sort. History came to Ireland with Christianity, and the writing of history came with the island's Christianization. Chronology as such did not exist before the Christianization of Ireland, which brought with it both the days of the week and the Julian calendar.<sup>55</sup>

<sup>53</sup> The most lucid exposition of the *communis opinio* of the earlier twentieth century is Hughes 1972: 99–162. McCarthy 1998 and McCarthy 2008: 1–117 require one to separate exposition from polemic. The most recent account, which appeared too late to be taken into account here, is Evans 2010.

<sup>54</sup> Indeed an outsider to the field is powerfully struck by how badly the Irish chronicles have been treated in modern scholarship, either not published at all or published in editions that were substandard even at the time they appeared. A new edition of *all* the surviving Irish chronicles is the greatest desideratum of early Irish scholarship and would be a great service to medieval scholarship as a whole: Dumville 1985.

<sup>55</sup> Hughes 1972: 146.

But Christianization in Ireland came very late in the history of the ancient world and from a place, Roman Britain, that was remote from the mainstreams of Mediterranean culture and expression (as the tortured Latin of Patrick demonstrates so clearly). The whole gamut of Mediterranean historical culture was not available to the Irish as they began to hesitantly record their history in written form, but rather only the attenuated chronicle tradition which antiquity bequeathed to the Middle Ages, mainly in the form of the chronicle epitome invented by Isidore and Bede. Thus, unlike any other European region in the early Middle Ages, Ireland received that chronicle tradition fully formed. That is to say, in the post-imperial kingdoms of the Latin West there was a live post-imperial historiographical tradition; in Ireland, the tradition was imported into and grafted onto a native culture that had previously known nothing of it. One might suppose that such a clean slate would make it easier to uncover the starting point of the Irish chronicling tradition, but in fact the nature of the earliest Irish chronicle is very difficult to discern behind the veil interposed by late evidence.

A brief overview of the main extant Irish chronicles will illustrate the problems we face.<sup>56</sup> The Annals of Ulster survives in a single manuscript, 1282 (*olim* H. 1. 8) of Trinity College, Dublin, and a number of later copies and translations.<sup>57</sup> It was copied in 1489 and then continued down to 1504. The first part of the manuscript is fragmentary, and only a short block covering the years from AD 81 to 387 survives. The text is complete for the period between 431 and 1100, with which we are concerned here.<sup>58</sup> The Annals of Inisfallen also survives in a single manuscript of the Bodleian Library, Rawlinson B. 503. The first portion of the codex was written in 1092, and the rest down to 1326 appears to be the result of continuous contemporary compilation in at least thirty-eight hands. It contains a complete text from the birth of Ishmael, with the exception of a gap between 232 BC to 70 BC (to use Jerome's chronology).<sup>59</sup>

The first fragment of the Annals of Tigernach, from *c.* 805 BC to AD 139, with an earlier forward reference to AD 154, is preserved in another Oxford manuscript,

<sup>56</sup> For a general overview, see Mac Niocaill 1975. McCarthy 2008: 1–117 provides an overview of the history of criticism of the Irish chronicles.

<sup>57</sup> For a complete list of the primary and secondary manuscripts of the chronicles discussed here, see McCarthy 2008: 361–63.

<sup>58</sup> McCarthy 2008: 34–37. Ed. by Mac Airt and Mac Niocaill 1983, and see Dumville 1985.

<sup>59</sup> McCarthy 2008: 37–40. Ed. by Mac Airt 1951. The manuscript can now be read on the web at <<http://image.ox.ac.uk/show?collection=bodleian&manuscript=msrawlb503>>.



Bodleian Library, Rawlinson B. 502, written around 1100.<sup>60</sup> Four further fragments (322 BC – AD 360, 489–766, 974–1003, and 1018–1178) are preserved in the late fourteenth-century manuscript, Bodleian Library, Rawlinson B. 488.<sup>61</sup> As a result of an entry in 1088 ascribing the work down to that point to a Tigernach, the composition of the chronicle has been attributed to Abbot Tigernach Ua Braein of Clonmacnoise who died in that year, although we need not consider the validity of this attribution here. Though it has not been noticed hitherto, these two sets of Tigernach fragments from different manuscripts actually provide us with two independent witnesses to an older Annals of Tigernach tradition, a point obscured in the texts' defective and incomplete nineteenth-century edition.<sup>62</sup>

The Annals of Boyle exists in a single manuscript, London, British Library, Cotton Titus A XXV, which was copied in 1228 and later compiled as a contemporary account down to 1257 by at least ten other scribes. Its text is a very short epitome, missing the first leaf and so starting 101 years before the birth of Enos. It continues without a major break for the period in which we are interested, down to 1201.<sup>63</sup> The *Chronicon Scotorum* survives in manuscript 1282 (*olim* H. 1. 8) of Trinity College, Dublin, the same manuscript that contains the Annals of Ulster, and was copied around 1640. The text is complete with the exception of a small lacuna between 723 and 803 and continues down to 1135 with a short supplement from 1141 to 1150.<sup>64</sup> The Annals of Roscrea survives in manuscript 5301/20 of the Koninklijke Bibliotheek van België. It was copied in 1641 and comprises a number of sets of extensive but confused fragments from Patrick down

<sup>60</sup> McCarthy 2008: 21–24. Ed. by Stokes 1895.

<sup>61</sup> Ed. by Stokes 1896 and Stokes 1897.

<sup>62</sup> Stokes 1895, Stokes 1896, and Stokes 1897. Both manuscripts can now be read on the web at <<http://image.ox.ac.uk/show?collection=bodleian&manuscript=msrawlb488>> and <<http://image.ox.ac.uk/show?collection=bodleian&manuscript=msrawlb502>>. Stokes failed to publish the beginning of fragment two because its contents overlapped with the end of fragment one, thereby omitting slightly more than three valuable manuscript pages. In another sign of the unscientific nature of his 'edition', Stokes provided no system with which to cite individual entries from the Annals, though to have done so would have reflected the standard scholarly practice of the era. (One may note the existence of a continuously paginated reprint of Stokes's edition, published by Llanerch in 1993 (see under Stokes 1993 in bibliography), but this is far more difficult to find than the original periodical publications.)

<sup>63</sup> McCarthy 2008: 40–44. Ed. by Freeman 1924–25.

<sup>64</sup> McCarthy 2008: 25–26. Ed. by Hennessy 1866. A better edition, based on an unpublished manuscript of Seán Mac Airt, is available online at <<http://www.ucc.ie/celt/published/G100016/>>.

to 995.<sup>65</sup> Finally, the Annals of Clonmacnoise, which extends to 1407, is available in an inferior 1685 copy of an English translation made in 1627.<sup>66</sup> There are other Irish chronicles, but they either contain too little non-Irish material in their extant state to be treated here or are too late in the chronicling tradition for us to consider.<sup>67</sup>

These various chronicles are often divided into two groups of related texts: the first, sometimes known as the Cuana group, is made up of the Annals of Inisfallen, Annals of Ulster, and Annals of Boyle; the second, widely known as the Clonmacnoise group, contains the Annals of Tigernach, Annals of Clonmacnoise, Annals of Roscrea, and the Chronicon Scotorum.<sup>68</sup> More so even than among continental medievalists, Irish specialists have tended to believe that the native chronicle tradition represented by these two groups of texts grew up from marginal notes in Easter tables, a belief encouraged by the characteristic (and unique) dating framework of the extant Irish chronicles: years marked by a K (for the 'kalendae' ('kalends') of January) rather than by regnal years, Olympiads, years from the birth of Abraham, or *anni domini*, along with ferials and epacts, which are the day of the week a year begins on and the phase of the moon on that day. In other words, the chronographic paraphernalia of authentic Easter tables. Yet despite that, there has never been any positive evidence for evolution out of Easter tables other than the complicated chronographic framework of the chronicles as extant, and there is no proof that this framework is even original and not just a later artefact.<sup>69</sup> For many years, it has been the common view that for the period down to AD 911/13, all extant Irish chronicles derive from a single lost text, conventionally known as the Chronicle of Ireland.<sup>70</sup> The starting point of this chronicle is less universally agreed

<sup>65</sup> McCarthy 2008: 26–34. Ed. by Gleeson and Mac Airt 1958.

<sup>66</sup> McCarthy 2008: 53–56, 286–93. Ed. by Murphy 1896.

<sup>67</sup> McCarthy 2008: 44–60 for a summary of these other texts.

<sup>68</sup> McCarthy 2008: 168–222, 361–62.

<sup>69</sup> There now can be almost no doubt, however, that all these markers are in fact later additions to the text. See Charles-Edwards 2006: 40–51. Hughes 1972: 146 and Harrison 1977–78 were both sceptical of the Easter-table hypothesis, which has been most firmly defended by Ó Cróinín 1983 (see also Ó Cróinín 2003).

<sup>70</sup> The *communis opinio* begins with O'Rahilly 1946: 235–59, but it was Hughes 1972 that cemented the preference for this inclusive designation as Chronicle of Ireland. Charles-Edwards 2006 offers a composite text in English, graphically displaying the evidence from the Annals of Ulster, the Annals of Tigernach, and the Chronicon Scotorum which he regards as certainly or plausibly derived from the Chronicle of Ireland, though the exercise tends to disguise how much duplication there is in the extant texts themselves, particularly the Annals of Ulster, which is the result of the earliest compilation processes.

upon. Insofar as there is a *communis opinio*, it affirms that the unified tradition of the Chronicle of Ireland covered the period from 431 to 911/13 and that the earliest edition of the Chronicle was completed on Iona in *c.* 740.<sup>71</sup> Historical coverage of the earlier periods in the extant manuscripts is considered to have arisen in a separate text, the so-called 'Irish World Chronicle', which was only in the tenth century appended to versions of the Chronicle of Ireland to create a single text from Creation to the contemporary period. It has, however, recently been strongly argued that the Chronicle of Ireland grew directly out of an earlier world chronicle. This new, quite revolutionary analysis demonstrates the weakness of many traditional dogmas about the Irish chronicle tradition, Easter-table origins most of all.<sup>72</sup>

A thorough analysis of the pre-700 material in all the Irish texts noted above, with particular attention given to the non-Irish material that they contain, leads to a series of conclusions that are sketched very briefly here, anticipating their full demonstration in a monograph devoted solely to the question.

The first point of importance is that there was indeed, as has long been accepted, an Iona chronicle, put together on that monastic island *c.* 740 and lying ultimately at the base of all our extant evidence. This original Iona chronicle, however, has long since disappeared. Its entries, Irish and especially non-Irish, have to a great extent been erased or rewritten through the nearly simultaneous but contradictory processes of epitomization and interpolation. The extant Annals of Ulster (post-431) and Annals of Inisfallen (pre-431) are the best witnesses to the text that remained after the early stages of that double process. A version of this text was then, in the tenth or eleventh century, heavily interpolated from Bede, Isidore, and Orosius among others, and its Irish history, especially before the mission of Palladius to Ireland in 431, was massively reworked and augmented to produce the text we now know by way of the tradition of the Annals of Tigernach — or what we can still call the Clonmacnoise tradition. At a later date, this expanded text was repeatedly epitomized and reworked, producing the welter of extant texts in which very little non-Irish material remains: the pre-431 text of the Annals of Ulster, as well as the Annals of Boyle, Annals of Clonmacnoise, Chronicon Scotorum, Annals of Roscrea, and the other, later chronicle texts that we are not considering here, such as the Annals of the Four Masters. This continuous process took centuries, and its

<sup>71</sup> Byrne 1967, Bannerman 1968, Smyth 1972, and McCarthy 2008: 153–67.

<sup>72</sup> McCarthy 2008 is an important and innovative book. Unfortunately, it devotes a great deal of space to the misguided notion that the universal chronicle that had found its way to Ireland was the work of Rufinus and, later, Sulpicius Severus, a text that is nowhere attested and highly implausible as reconstructed by McCarthy.

evidentiary effect is such that one cannot be completely certain whether any individual entry in the *Annals of Tigernach*, *Annals of Ulster*, or *Annals of Inisfallen* is a survivor from the original Iona chronicle or the result of later interpolation, since chronicle texts from different traditions were still being compared with one another at a late date. This comparison led to the creation of superficial similarities among texts of different traditions. Yet granted all that, one can achieve some certainty in general terms about the nature of the Iona Chronicle and its antecedents.

To begin with, the long-recognized divide between the material that precedes the mission of Palladius to Ireland in 431, which derives ultimately from the chronicle of Prosper, and that which follows it is quite real, though only as a later artefact of the tradition. However, the pre-Palladian chronicle divides into only two distinct surviving traditions. The first and oldest is found only in the *Annals of Inisfallen* (which is very fragmentary), while the second is the *Tigernach* or *Clonmacnoise* tradition. This latter family divides into two related subfamilies: the first subfamily is found in the *Annals of Tigernach*, *Annals of Clonmacnoise*, *Chronicon Scotorum*, and the *Annals of Roscrea* (the *Annals of Tigernach* is the most complete, while the others are merely different and later recensions of either the text of one of the two extant *Annals of Tigernach* manuscripts or its tradition); the second subfamily is found in the *Annals of Ulster* (pre-431) and the *Annals of Boyle*, which are both heavily epitomized witnesses to a modified *Tigernach* tradition.

By contrast with the pre-Palladian text, the post-Palladian text has three basic witnesses: the *Annals of Tigernach/Clonmacnoise* tradition, the *Annals of Ulster*, and the *Annals of Inisfallen*. The *Annals of Inisfallen* is an extreme epitome of a text very closely related to the *Annals of Ulster*, and that *Ulster* tradition provides the foundation of the *Tigernach* tradition, though the latter has been greatly expanded through interpolation, as noted above. It may be that this interpolation was undertaken at the time of the creation of the *Clonmacnoise* tradition early in the tenth century, but on the other hand it could have taken place at any date between then and *c.* 1100, the date of the earliest *Tigernach* manuscript. Like the pre-Palladian section, the post-Palladian sections of the *Annals of Boyle*, the *Chronicon Scotorum*, the *Annals of Clonmacnoise*, and the *Annals of Roscrea* are very closely related to the *Tigernach* tradition, but they are independent recensions of it.

As the above summary makes clear, the pre-431 text of the *Annals of Ulster* does not belong to its post-431 text. This means that the original pre-Palladian text of the *Annals of Ulster* — the remnants of which are still visible in the *Annals of Inisfallen* — was at some point removed or lost from the post-Palladian section; then, at some date before the existing manuscript was copied at the end of the fifteenth century, a new copy of the pre-Palladian section was made from a manuscript in

the Tigernach/Clonmacnoise tradition and added to the post-Palladian Annals of Ulster to create the extant text. Many scholars in the past have realized this fact of addition, but have assumed that there never was a pre-431 text. This would now seem not to be the case.

Additional conclusions can be reached about the sources of interpolation in the extant chronicle texts. Among all the extant works, the pre-Palladian text of the Annals of Inisfallen displays only very minor evidence of late interpolation from Bede. There may be other interpolations from Bede or from other sources, but these cannot now be identified as interpolations. By contrast, both the pre- and the post-431 texts of the whole Annals of Tigernach tradition display abundant evidence of late interpolation from Bede, Isidore, and Orosius for the most part, generally in easily identifiable blocks of text.

However, and in spite of this massive but late interpolation from Bede and these other texts, sufficient evidence survives to prove with a reasonable degree of certainty that Bede and the first Irish chronicles did in fact share a common source. What is more, the evidence of comparative internal chronologies and accession entries in both texts show that this common source concluded in the year 640. The nature of a number of parallel entries in Bede's two chronicles and the Irish chronicle traditions shows that this common source was probably a version of Isidore's first chronicle, expanded and continued down to 640. This 'Isidorus *auctus*' may have been an indigenous Irish compilation, but more likely it was a product of Britain or rather a Columban monastery of Gaul. Wherever it was produced, it provided a common basis for the Irish chronicle tradition and the work of Bede and was in the hands of the first Irish chroniclers within six years of composition.

Meanwhile, it would seem that, at some point between 447 and 521, an eighty-four-year paschal table travelled from Britain to Ireland. In the margins of this table were two notes, one concerning a large snowfall, dated to 438, and the other concerning the solar eclipse of 447. These are the only references to these fifth-century events in the surviving contemporary literature. The data appended to the notice of the eclipse entry demonstrate its contemporaneity and its probable origin, and while there is no direct evidence for an Easter table, it is the most likely vehicle for the transmission of two such completely isolated meteorological and celestial events two hundred years before the earliest composition of the first identifiable Irish chronicle. In Ireland, this table was recopied or reused for another cycle, which would have extended from 522 to 606. Then, starting no later than 541, this document began to be annotated with important as well as mnemonic events, as a way of helping to assign specific years to each row of figures (because, as we must remember, a cyclical chronology not linked to an absolute chronology is very difficult

to use over long periods). The initial impetus for annotation no doubt came from the extant two notes and particularly the death and destruction wrought in Ireland by the Justinianic plague.<sup>73</sup> Over time, however, other items of purely local interest — the deaths of prominent ecclesiastics and royal figures, as well as famous battles and various types of unusual natural phenomena — were added here and there. This process of annotation may have continued beyond the limits of the second copy of the Easter table, which would have concluded in 606, or perhaps more likely a second cycle was added to the recopied first cycle, since the added marginal events would have prevented the table from being used a second time (the original two entries in 438 and 447 would have been no impediment to the reuse of the table the first time). The annotation of this Easter table took place in north-eastern Ireland, in an area that was influenced both by events in Brega (the location of the natural phenomena recorded) and by the church in Armagh (the bishop/abbot list between Ailill (†536) and Mac Laisre (†623) is original and contemporary). This would indeed have been an example of a text that had started as a paschal table but was evolving towards a chronicle, infrequent though the notices would have been. It would have started out like the *Paschale Campanum*, which has contemporary notices between 493 and 512, and in the end would have resembled other extant paschal chronicles that were composed on the Continent hundreds of years later.

Somewhere around 646 the augmented text of Isidore to 640, the Irish paschal chronicle described above, and probably a text of Jerome's *Chronici canones* with the chronicle of Prosper appended came into the hands of a cleric or monk on the island of Iona. Inspired by the new texts of history and the possibility of adding the history of Ireland to this outline of God's providential plan he created a new compilation chronicle. This new chronicle was a complex and lengthy compilation of human history from the creation of the world, based fundamentally upon the augmented Isidore, Jerome, Prosper, Marcellinus *comes*, and an early edition of the *Liber pontificalis* that ended in 606. To this was added history from the Old Testament in Jerome's translation (i.e. the Vulgate), Jerome's commentary on Daniel, Rufinus's *Historia ecclesiastica*, and perhaps Orosius, a Latin translation of Josephus, and Isidore's *Etymologiae*, though the latter may only be later additions (it would have been at the time a brand new work). We may be sure that this compilation had other unknown or no longer identifiable sources as well, and indeed the text of some of the above-mentioned sources may have been derived not directly from them but from other earlier, but unknown compilations.

<sup>73</sup> Irish evidence for this summarized in Dooley 2006.

Unfortunately for the compiler, there was no obvious factual or chronological link between the account of world history in his chronicles and the jejune account of Irish history that was contained in his annotated Easter cycle. However, the evidence shows that he used the date of the death of Heraclius from his copy of Isidore *auctus* to synchronize his account of world history and his account of Irish history. But not all was as it seemed: it would appear that the compiler of the 640 edition of Isidore made an assumption about the date of the death of Heraclius on the basis of the accession of Heraclonas: he assumed that because Heraclonas had been proclaimed augustus, Heraclius must have been dead. He then counted two years of Heraclonas to the end of his text. Now the Irish chronicler knew that Heraclius had died five years earlier and so synchronized the events of five years earlier to the year following Heraclius's death. So far so good. Unfortunately, the chronicler did not know that Heraclonas had actually been proclaimed augustus on 4 July 638, three years before Heraclius's death. As a result, events he thought he was dating to the year we call 641 were in fact dated to our year 639. Consequently, all the material he drew from his imperial chronicles ended up being dated three years too late in relation to his Irish material, or rather, from our point of view, all Irish history, right back to the unusual snowfall and the eclipse of 447, was dated three years too early.<sup>74</sup> The compiler, however, was unaware of this problem.

It was at this time in the compilation of this chronicle that the first research was undertaken into Irish history: many of the laconic notes from the Easter table were expanded and other events over the previous three decades in particular and earlier were added, bringing the historical record down to *c.* December 645 and extending it back to the mid-sixth century and before. This was the first real Irish chronicle, the predecessor to the Iona Chronicle, which was the antecedent of what we can safely call the Chronicle of Ireland.

Although this original chronicle of *c.* 646 had been structured by regnal years — being based as it was on Jerome, Prosper, Marcellinus, and the extended Isidore — this structure could obviously only be maintained down to 640 (registered as the second year of Heraclonas in Isidore *auctus*) where his last non-Irish source ended. The evidence suggests that the compiler did not know the name or regnal years of the current Byzantine emperor, and so he simply extended his text over its

<sup>74</sup> It is well known that Irish and British events before 642 are dated two or three years early. See Charles-Edwards 2006: 39 and 43. Although this is not the place to set forth the evidence, the death of Domnall son of Aed (642 in the Irish tradition) is also antedated three years. Events misdated by only two years form a coherent block of material, and this lesser error can be explained through *Quellenforschung* as well.

last five or six years with what seems to have been the only chronological marker he had at his disposal: 'kalendis Ianuariis' or rather 'kal. Ian.', the way of noting each new year on the left-hand edge of an Easter table. This was a plausible way of marking each new year in a place like Ireland, where neither a single series of regnal years nor any other universally acknowledged chronological system was available. It was no doubt intended to be a temporary expedient in advance of further information that was, in the event, never forthcoming. Unfortunately, later continuations of the chronicle retained this system of marking years, laying the foundation for what would eventually become the characteristic framework of the Irish chronicle. Eventually, at some stage of epitomization or expansion, all the earlier regnal years of the chronicle were replaced by this system, which was no doubt at the same time reduced to the basic 'K' that we still see as the basis of the annalistic chronology. This reworking, however, left the whole chronicle open to chronological corruption, which began, it would seem, almost immediately. With this new Iona Chronicle available as the focus of later annalistic compilation, the original annotated Easter-table compilation was abandoned.

There appear to have been two continuations undertaken before the end of the seventh century, one in the late 660s or early 670s and the other in the late 690s, though contemporary and retrospective notes were probably added at many different times between *c.* 646 and 700. The second continuation was mostly made up of a block of text from 676 to 691 that, either through error or deliberate calculation, caused some or all the events in this period to be dated one year late. Another error led to the dating of events in 704–05 one year early. In a pre-*annus Domini* system before the acceptance of Dionysius's paschal cycle such minor errors are to be expected.

This same half century of intermittent annotation also created another characteristic of the Irish tradition: some time in the late 660s or early 670s, a series of 'historical epacts' was added to the chronicle. These epacts are completely different from any system of epacts found in any known Easter table, and it therefore cannot be coincidence that this system exactly describes the actual lunar epacts at this period (which no other system of paschal epacts does). These may have been a local measure of time invented to help keep track of passing years when there was no other means available, although there is almost no evidence for that hypothesis. They may also have been created specifically for the new chronicle. We cannot tell. It may have been at the same time that an accurate account of years *ab incarnatione* was added, starting from Jerome's date for the Incarnation (thus 1 BC = 1 *ab incarnatione*), though this calculation may equally have been part of the original compilation in *c.* 646. Regardless of that, it was certainly at this time that the three-year



error between the Irish and the non-Irish material was discovered and corrected by the addition of three blank years near the end of the first edition, one of which, 648, still remains blank in extant texts. As a result of this correction, the chronology for Irish events is correct within one year either way from at least 651 forwards.

Because of its ultimate derivation from Prosper, and what appears to have been the first written account of Irish history with a universal chronology, this Iona Chronicle was the first document to juxtapose the Irish missionaries Palladius and Patrick in the same text, Palladius in 431 and Patrick between 471 and 493 (= 474 and 496 corrected), as it must have been originally from the surviving evidence of the chronicles. Because of Prosper's undoubted authority this had the potential to cause real problems for local traditions that made Patrick the unquestioned first apostle of Ireland. It seems likely that the hagiographers Tírechán and Muirchú, among others, read this new chronicle in the late 680s and early 690s and realized the problem that this new chronology created. It must be remembered that there is no evidence that a written native Irish chronology had ever existed before the creation of this first version of the Iona Chronicle; even if one had existed, it had certainly never before been synchronized with Roman history, much less Prosper's chronicle, the only source for the mission of Palladius. Both Tírechán and Muirchú responded to the challenge by back-dating Patrick's arrival to the time of Palladius (or perhaps even before in Tírechán's case; his original chronology is uncertain). The popularity of their hagiographical works rapidly led to the belief that Patrick had arrived in Ireland in 432 rather than the 470s. As a result, during an early (eighth-century?) phase of revision, Patrick's death was backdated in the Iona Chronicle by thirty-two years and all contemporary history taken back with him. This left a gap of thirty-two years at the end of the fifth century that had to be filled in various ways, often by simple fabrication. The focus on Patrick meant that any and all tales involving him and those related to him and his followers soon began to fill the earliest post-Palladian pages of the growing Iona Chronicle.

With this simple chronological trick, the focus of the post-Palladian section of the text was transformed. What had previously been a compilation of late Roman chronicles with occasional Irish annotation became the story of Patrick and Irish history. As more Irish material was added to the early parts of the post-Palladian chronicle, later compilers gradually weeded out the original non-Irish material, leaving behind mainly the Irish text and only a little bit from Prosper, Marcellinus, 'Eusebius' (i.e. the *Liber pontificalis*), and Isidore, generally material having to do with emperors, popes, and natural phenomena. The Irish material therefore assumed a much more prominent and uncluttered position in the developing tradition of the Chronicle of Ireland, inaugurating the fundamental and still highly visible

difference between the pre- and post-Palladian material. Later, as a response to the successful weeding of non-Irish material from the post-Palladian text, the pre-Palladian text came to be heavily abbreviated as well. However, because there was so much less Irish material in this section, a basic continuum from Adam to Theodosius II was retained to link Irish history with the Old Testament and the great Mediterranean kingdoms of the past. This is the kind of epitomization that every recension of these texts would face throughout their existence, to the point that in some cases little if any of the original non-Irish material remained in the latest versions of the tradition. Gradually, a fabricated Irish pre-Palladian history was added to create an extensive Irish narrative going back into the antediluvian First Age of the world. That invented tradition soon edged out what little pre-Palladian Mediterranean history remained, as, for instance, in the *Annals of the Four Masters* and the *Annals of Clonmacnoise*.

As mentioned above, epitomization continued simultaneously alongside a contradictory tendency towards interpolation. Thus at various unrecoverable dates after 725, but before the tenth or eleventh century, various individual entries from Bede were interpolated into the chronicle, particularly his continuous Byzantine regnal-year chronology from the mid-seventh century down to 725. A more systematic attempt at interpolation began in the tenth or eleventh century, when a compiler took a text of the *Clonmacnoise* recension, or while he was actually creating that recension in the tenth century, and completely rewrote it, adding material from various sources, but particularly Bede, Orosius, and Isidore, as we have noted above. This created the still recognizable *Annals of Tigernach* tradition. Almost immediately, however, the process of epitomization that had affected earlier recensions began again on this newly expanded recension. Throughout this process, over many centuries, poorly trained, hasty, or bored scribes were responsible for the copying and recopying of these works, resulting in textual corruption on a large scale, especially with regard to numbers and the frequent Ks. This corruption was particularly severe in the *Annals of Tigernach* tradition, but it affects almost everything to do with the Irish chronicles and has produced the rebarbative textual morass now much exacerbated by the absence of adequate modern editions.

As we noted at the outset of this section, the notes sketched above are nothing more than a short *précis* of conclusions and hypotheses that can and must be demonstrated at length on the basis of a survey of the extant evidence. To specialists, some of the hypotheses just outlined are likely to look impossibly radical, while non-specialists will perhaps feel that rather too much has been said. Nevertheless, it is important to understand the place of the Irish chronicle tradition within its larger early medieval and post-Roman context. Late antique chronicles developed

out of a millennia-old tradition of chronicling, the only historiographical mode to enjoy perfect continuity between antiquity and the early Middle Ages, in both the Greek and Latin worlds. In Latin, it was the new chronicle epitome, invented by Isidore and popularized by Bede, that provided much of the inspiration for future developments. What emerges from a careful examination of the Irish tradition, however, is valuable evidence for the wider world of the early Middle Ages. Bede seems to have used the same version of Isidore that the Irish compiler had access to, but perhaps more important he used all the same basic sources (and many more) that the Irish compiler had as well, including the chronicle of Marcellinus *comes*, written in Constantinople. This shows that as Christianity spread throughout the British Isles, Christian history, and indeed a standard selection of Christian history, followed closely in its wake. Moreover, the sources shared by the Irish compiler and Bede transmitted large parts of the late antique Latin tradition of chronicling to the British Isles in the same way that Bede would reintroduce much of that material to the Continent. In Ireland, a unique local chronicling tradition grew up, but one that was constantly reinforced by, and crossed over with, other chronicling traditions, both ancient and more recent, in spite of its apparent isolation. That process is one that we can see elsewhere in the medieval Latin West, not least in the Carolingian Empire and the many neighbouring regions that it decisively influenced. Before moving to a discussion of these Frankish chronicles, we can turn to the Byzantine chronicle tradition, in which we might expect more continuity with ancient traditions than we actually find.

### *Chronicles in Byzantium*

It is often assumed, without much reflection, that because the Byzantine Empire was an empire of *Ῥωμαῖοι* and because its emperors were 'Roman' emperors, the continuity of eastern traditions was considerably greater than what we find in the West. Part of that assumption may reflect a very old tradition of regarding the Orient (to which Byzantium was relegated in the minds of many modern thinkers) as static and unchanging, by contrast to Latin, western European, and latterly American, dynamism. But it is not just non-specialists who take such positions: even historians of late antiquity and medievalists tend to assume greater continuity, and less innovation, in the Greek East than in the Latin West, an approach that is exaggerated by the tendency of Byzantinists to define as 'early Byzantine' the period that most other scholars now call late antiquity. The 'early Byzantine' designation, which usually covers the fourth through the seventh centuries, is an

unfortunate one, for in that period East and West shared a history that was still recognizably late classical in most respects; certainly the sixth century, whether in Gaul or in Asia Minor, had more in common with the high imperial period than it did with Byzantium of the eleventh century. That is because the eastern empire did eventually — in the later sixth and seventh centuries — experience the kind of cultural, political, and economic dislocation that was so catastrophic for the West from the early fifth century onwards. What emerged from the aftermath of the Arab conquests was a very different polity, as unrecognizable in late Roman terms as was the Carolingian Empire of the later eighth century in the West. That is to say, the Byzantine Empire from the later seventh century onwards can claim no more continuity with the Roman past than can any corner of the West, something which specialists are finally beginning to absorb more deeply into their works.<sup>75</sup>

The very real break between ancient past and Byzantine Middle Ages is also confirmed by developments in the historiography and literature of the period: just as in the West, only the chronicle genre really survived uninterrupted from late antiquity to the ‘Macedonian Renaissance’ of Middle Byzantine literature.<sup>76</sup> Again as in the West, the more expansive and literary historical genres had to be rediscovered in Byzantium after the hiatus of the early Middle Ages.<sup>77</sup> It is worth pointing out here, as we have done in many other contexts, that many Byzantine texts that are conventionally known as chronicles are in fact nothing of the sort.<sup>78</sup> Many

<sup>75</sup> The crucial differences between late antiquity and the period from *c.* 600 onwards are recognized by Whittow 1996, the best introduction to the topic. The old and untenable periodization of works like Ostrogorsky 1969 has unfortunately been perpetuated in Treadgold 1997, which has Byzantine history begin with Diocletian.

<sup>76</sup> Lemerle 1986: 81–120, which shows continuity only at the level of the most basic education. See Kazhdan 1999: 15 for the ‘medievalization’ of Byzantine literature. For the writers and works covered in this section, Moravcsik 1958: 165–580 is still indispensable as a reference to the nineteenth-century literature, and also remains a more user-friendly catalogue of key historical sources than the more analytical handbook of Hunger 1978: I, 243–507. Karayannopoulos and Weiß 1982 does not improve upon either earlier work, but includes a brief discussion of the Syrian and Armenian texts which are not treated here.

<sup>77</sup> Kazhdan 1999: 19, 206–34 is rare in explicitly recognizing the western parallel.

<sup>78</sup> Hunger 1978: II, 243–330 is particularly loose in his use of ‘chronicle’ and ‘chronicler’, recommending, at p. 254, on the basis of the proems to Byzantine historians themselves, that the distinction between chronicle and history not be taken too seriously. Kazhdan 1999: 206 claims that ‘minor historian’ and ‘chronographer’ can be used as synonyms. Whitby 1992 is the best overall account of very late antique historical traditions in Greek, though he follows the typical Byzantinist classification of Malalas’s work as a chronicle.

of the best-known historical texts of Greek late antiquity are actually miscellanies, like the *Scriptores Originum Constantinopolitanarum*, for instance, or epitome histories/*breviaria*, like the *Chronographia* of John Malalas.

Malalas does, however, require a short discussion. He was an educated clerk, working perhaps in the bureau of the *magister militum per Orientem* or the *comes Orientis* in the years after the turn of the fifth to the sixth century.<sup>79</sup> The surname by which he is conventionally known first appears in late references to him, derived from the Syriac word *mll*, 'the eloquent', although in Evagrius Scholasticus's church history he is known as John the Rhetor, the Greek equivalent of his Syriac name. His work, which is preserved in a single Oxford manuscript (Bodleian Library, Baroccianus graecus 182, as well as many excerpts and fragments in other independent manuscripts), was perhaps written in two stages, the first in Antioch, ending between 528 and 532, the second at Constantinople after 563.<sup>80</sup> It shows obvious signs of abbreviation in its extant form, but even in its original form it was already an epitome. Its standard designation as a *Chronographia* is therefore quite misleading. In the manuscripts, the work is introduced as 'a report/memorandum (*ἐγκύκλιον*) of John, descended from the time of Constantine the Great, from (the) times of (the) creation of (the) world'.<sup>81</sup> The use of the word *ἐγκύκλιον* implies the brevity of the work, and though it is sometimes argued that the title *Chronographia* was Malalas's own, that cannot be proven.<sup>82</sup> His Antiochocentric composition may well have had genuine chronicles amongst its sources, but Malalas reduced them to a state in which the chronographic frame not only failed to play the kind of shaping role that it does in real chronicles, but is often totally obscured.<sup>83</sup> Indeed, Malalas deploys no consistent chronographic apparatus, his exposition is not annalistic, and the years are not marked off according to any

<sup>79</sup> Thurn 2000: 1\*. In general, see Croke 1990c.

<sup>80</sup> Thurn 2000: 3\* and Croke 1990c: 17–25. Evagrius, the *Chronicon Paschale*, and the Slavic translation seem to know the short version; John of Ephesus, Michael the Syrian, Theophanes, and the Latin translation the long.

<sup>81</sup> What precisely the reference to the time of Constantine the Great means is a matter of debate — grammatically the phrase refers to John himself and implies that he could trace his family back to the time of Constantine — and may represent faulty epitomization of the original epigraph (see Croke 1990c: 2).

<sup>82</sup> Jeffreys and others 1986: xxi.

<sup>83</sup> Hunger 1978: II, 319–26. We cannot say that Malalas used the 'city chronicles' of Constantinople and Antioch, *pace* Jeffreys and others 1986: xxiii and Jeffreys 1990b: 204–08, because no such things existed, as we shall see in Volume II (note also pp. 146–50, 156–65, 168–69 above).

chronological system; this means that the record of the passage of time is subordinated to an epitomized narrative, running from the creation of Adam down to what we know as 563, where the manuscript breaks off.<sup>84</sup> The text is in eighteen books, the last four of which each covers a single imperial reign. Originally, the work probably extended to the death of Justinian in 565 or perhaps even later.<sup>85</sup> Only at the very end are month and indiction dates introduced; it may be this apparatus that misleads those who use Malalas solely for his near-contemporary content into thinking that his work is a clear-cut representative of the chronicle genre, in the mode of Eusebius-Jerome. It is not. With its universalism and its absence of a clear chronographic framework, it may be one of the forerunners of the later Byzantine universal histories (or 'world chronicles', as Byzantinists often call them): massive, universal, but unconcerned with the rigorous imposition of chronology, let alone an annalistic or even somewhat annalistic chronographic frame.<sup>86</sup> In terms of the definitions adopted in the present work, however, Malalas wrote a *breviarium* of world history, from Adam to his own day, but on a scale considerably larger than the epitomes and *breviaria* of the fourth and fifth centuries themselves.<sup>87</sup>

### **The *Chronicon Paschale* and the Last Late Antique Chronicles in the Byzantine World**

By contrast, a seventh-century source that used Malalas is indeed a chronicle. The *Chronicon Paschale*, which we have chanced across more than once in the preceding chapters for the traces of Latin consularia it preserves, is a compilation that survives

<sup>84</sup> For the different chronographic structures underlying the text, see Jeffreys 1990a, but one must emphasize that these are implicit, rising to the surface only periodically, and often exhibiting errors of reckoning that seriously undermine the notion that a consistent chronographic scaffolding does actually lie beneath the narrative.

<sup>85</sup> Thurn 2000: 1\*–2\* and Croke 1990c.

<sup>86</sup> That is to say, if one accepts that 'Byzantine world chronicles' are universal histories, usually going back to Creation or a similar point in the distant past, then there is no difficulty in using the term chronicle to describe them, any more than there is in western medievalists talking about Froissart's *Chronicle*. Where the designation becomes misleading is in its implication of a close connection to the ancient chronicle tradition of Eusebius, which does not exist.

<sup>87</sup> One may note, however, that the text of Malalas could be used to produce shorter works, like the emperor list from Augustus to Justin II known as the *Laterculius Malalianus* (Mommmsen 1898: 426–37), although only about a third of the text actually depends on Malalas himself; see Stevenson 1990.

in a single tenth-century Vatican manuscript (Vat. gr. 1941) that also includes a prodigy list and a few other chronicle excerpts that are unique as extant.<sup>88</sup> Running from Adam to the twentieth year of Heraclius (629), the *Chronicon Paschale* is part chronicle epitome, of the sort then being pioneered in the West by Isidore; part consularia, being based upon a Greek translation of the *Descriptio consulum*; and part chronicle in the mould of Eusebius-Jerome, but it is indeed a real chronicle, unlike Malalas: the *Chronicon Paschale* has a full annalistic apparatus from the first year of Abraham down to the end of the text, whether or not there is information to place under every year; Malalas produces an expository narrative into which dates are intermittently obtruded. However, one often finds that long and detailed narrative accounts, more suited to, and in many cases deriving from, narrative histories (like Malalas), disrupt the annalistic chronology for many pages at a time, as the author pursues his own narratives and interests (often with their own independent chronology), and he then returns to the annalistic designation of each succeeding year. Thus events of many years can be narrated under the lemma for a single year, whether they have a chronological relationship to that year or not. It is clear that the author was interested in producing an abbreviated history, but was not bound by any overarching concern for genre: whatever sources he had, he used and combined in the best way he could. At the same time, he also retains the basic insistence upon the precise chronological dating of the years that he does report annalistically and the events that took place in them: for the imperial period, for instance, the author uses Olympiads, indictions, regnal years, and consular years for each year, synchronizing them to his basic *annus mundi* chronology at each new accession. The author's *annus mundi* dates place the birth of Christ in AM 5507 (= 1 BC), a calculation of the age of the world that is first attested in this very work.<sup>89</sup> The standard Byzantine era of later centuries is very close to that of the *Chronicon Paschale*, but there is no way of telling whether the author of the *Chronicon* was in fact its inventor.<sup>90</sup> Although not all the author's sources are of the

<sup>88</sup> See Moravcsik 1958: 241–43, Hunger 1978: I, 328–29, and Whitby and Whitby 1989. Treadgold 2007: 340–49 seems not to realize the profound distance at which the *Chronicon Paschale* stands from the classicizing historians who make up the main subject of his work. For the excerpts from a 'great chronicle' in the same Vatican manuscript, see Schreiner 1975: 37–45, Schreiner 1977: 44, and below, at note 118. For the prodigy list, see Freund 1882: 38–42.

<sup>89</sup> Grumel 1958: 73–84 and Whitby and Whitby 1989: xxiii.

<sup>90</sup> For the whole problem of the Byzantine era, see Grumel 1958: 56–128 and in particular for the evidence of the *Chronicon Paschale*, see Mosshammer 2008: 278–316. It appears to have been created to ensure that the solar, lunar, and indiction cycles would all run on the same sequence.

chronicle type, he clearly did use *fasti* and *consularia*, particularly a Greek recension of the *Descriptio consulum* and what may have been a continuation of it also used by Marcellinus *comes*, as well as taking over large parts of Malalas word for word.<sup>91</sup>

With its combination of epitome history and continued focus on annalistic chronological precision, expressed particularly by regnal years, Olympiads, and consuls, the *Chronicon Paschale* is an intermediate step in the historiographical transition from antiquity to the Middle Ages, just as Isidore and Bede's chronicles are in the West. In the priority given to the *annus mundi* dates in the *Chronicon Paschale* for the overall establishment of the chronology (though not necessarily on a year-by-year basis) we see one of the main distinguishing marks of Byzantine historiography, and an area in which Byzantine writers differed dramatically from their contemporaries in the West: whereas in the West the *annus domini* system of Dionysius had become the norm by the eighth century, it only began to appear regularly in Greek sources of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, under the influence of the Italian Renaissance and its Latin scholarly approach to the past. In the East, whenever a universal chronology was needed for historical purposes, it was *anni mundi* that provided it, as was the case (and still is) in the Jewish traditions.

The rigorously annalistic format, brevity, paratactic style, and concentration on chronographic apparatus place the *Chronicon Paschale* squarely in the tradition of late ancient chronicles. But it stands at the end of that tradition and had no visible influence on later Byzantine historiography.<sup>92</sup> It also has no known contemporaries: some late antique chronicles in Greek can be inferred to have existed on the basis of traces in later authors, but none is extant and the meaning of the word 'chronicle' in the modern scholarship that posits them is uncertain.<sup>93</sup> The influence of *breviaria* and epitome histories that we see behind the chronicles of Isidore and Bede can also be seen in the *Chronicon Paschale* in its longer, more detailed narrative sections. That combination of narrative passages with chronicle and consularia material is very medieval.

<sup>91</sup> For the sources, see Whitby and Whitby 1989: xv–xxii, but with the same reservations about 'city chronicles' noted in our discussion of Malalas (note 83).

<sup>92</sup> Unless, that is, the later system of *anni mundi* dates beginning in 5509 BC was borrowed from the *Chronicon*, which cannot be determined.

<sup>93</sup> Mango 1990: 14–16 postulates two separate Constantinopolitan chronicles lying behind the *Breviarium* of Patriarch Nicephorus and the *Chronographia* of Theophanes for parts of their seventh- and eighth-century information. On the other hand, a Greek chronicle that included an Alexandrian recension of a mid-fifth-century witness to the Consularia Italica tradition is clearly visible in Theophanes: see Mango and Scott 1997: lxxviii–lxxx and Volume II.



By contrast with the Greek tradition, the chronicle genre as it had developed during the Roman imperial period and late antiquity continued to exist without interruption in Syriac, and later in Armenian and Arabic, as well as other languages, well into the high Middle Ages. The rich but textually very complicated Syriac tradition was inspired by a Syriac translation of Eusebius's chronicle in much the same way that Jerome's translation affected the West. So continuous was the Syriac chronicling tradition that it was even drawn upon by Theophanes, a Middle Byzantine author writing in Greek.<sup>94</sup> Although these Syriac sources do in fact belong to a late phase of the tradition outlined in the present volume, considering them (and those in other languages) at any length here would both extend the book unnecessarily and also stretch the limits of the authors' competence at too great a risk of error.<sup>95</sup> Here we need merely note that while the late ancient chronicle tradition continued in Syriac (as it did in Latin), it became virtually extinct in Greek after the early seventh-century *Chronicon Paschale*.

### Syncellus and Theophanes

The only two sources that are more or less comparable to that text — the chronicles of George Syncellus and Theophanes, of which the former imitates Africanus and Eusebius's *Chronographia*, while the latter is more of a true chronicle in the sense we adopt here — were composed nearly two hundred years later. They appeared after a very long break in Byzantine historiography more generally, a break caused by the shrinking of geographical and chronological horizons in the aftermath of military defeat and pervasive social collapse.<sup>96</sup> It was not until the rise of a new, stronger imperial centre in the ninth century that historiographical traditions revived, in a manner somewhat analogous to the impact of the Carolingians on the western writing of history; that analogy even extends to the development of new scripts to accommodate the revival of learning: Caroline minuscule in the West and Greek *Buchminuskel* in the East.<sup>97</sup> The first fruits of this revival visible

<sup>94</sup> Theophanes used and was heavily influenced by a Syriac chronicle, probably in a Greek translation: Mango and Scott 1997: lxxxii–lxxxvii.

<sup>95</sup> Those wishing a bibliographical overview of the Syriac chronicle tradition should consult 'Chapter 6, note 95' in the Appendices to the Footnotes, pp. 375–77 below.

<sup>96</sup> Mango 1975, Dagron 1984: 315–30, Whitby 1992: 70–73, and Averil Cameron 1992: 84–86.

<sup>97</sup> Dain 1954, Lemerle 1986: 121–69, and Ševčenko 1992. For the script, see the essays in *La Paléographie grecque et byzantine* and Wilson 1973.

to us are the works of George Syncellus and his continuator Theophanes. Syncellus is a hybrid work. It combines a frequently annalistic *breviarium* style with the chronographic analysis and regnal-year lists that we see in Africanus, and also a penchant for the compilation of large sections of other works that discuss chronological matters, as had been the case with Eusebius's *Chronographia*. Theophanes is a true chronicle according to our definition to the extent that it is rigorously annalistic and its chronographic apparatus is as important to its purpose as is the recording of the contents. Where these works differ from the *Chronicon Paschale* and other late antique chronicles is in the scale of their contents, which is enormous, much larger than those of the short chronicles of antiquity and closer to Malalas's epitome history in scope and bulk. It is, indeed, possible to look at their ninth-century revival of Byzantine history writing as an attempt at combining the universal-historical impulse of Malalas with the rigorous chronographic framework of the ancient chronicle tradition.

George Syncellus, writing between c. 808 and 810, compiled a chronograph that ran from Adam until the accession of Diocletian, and his chronology of the ancient world was widely used by later authors like John Scylitzes.<sup>98</sup> Shortly after George died, an author known as Theophanes Confessor continued his work down to the ninth century.<sup>99</sup> George was the *synkellos*, or secretary, of the patriarch Tarasius of Constantinople (784–806), hence the name by which he is always known. He referred to his own work indifferently as *Χρονογραφία*, *Χρονογραφείον*, and *Χρονογράφιον*. Theophanes calls it *Χρονογραφία σύντομος*, and most manuscripts call it a *Χρονογραφία ἐν ἐπιτόμῳ*, but in the best manuscript it is called *Ἐκλογή χρονογραφίας*, though its modern editor uses the Latinized title *Ecloga chronographica*.<sup>100</sup> Like many of the late antique Christian chroniclers whom we discussed in Chapter 4, Syncellus was deeply concerned with the calculation of the world's Christian chronology, which is to say, with its beginning and its destined end. This placed him in more or less open contention with his predecessor

<sup>98</sup> Hunger 1978: I, 331–32, Huxley 1981, Kazhdan 1999: 206–08, and Adler and Tuffin 2002: xxix–lxxv.

<sup>99</sup> Hunger 1978: I, 334–39, Mango and Scott 1997: xliii–c, and Kazhdan 1999: 215–34. We are not convinced that there is much insight to be gained from regarding Theophanes as little more than an editor and publisher of George's research, following Mango 1978 and Ševčenko 1992: 287–89, but note that Mango and Scott 1997: lv accepts that the question lacks practical consequences for *Quellenforschung*.

<sup>100</sup> Adler and Tuffin 2002: xxix and Mosshammer 1984: xxv. This shows how difficult it can be to determine what the 'title' of any work from the ancient or medieval world really was.

Eusebius, who was suspicious of the eschatological motives behind such interests, and it is perhaps unsurprising that while Syncellus treats Julius Africanus reverently even where he corrects him, he is harshly critical of Eusebius; he is equally critical of the now lost works of two Alexandrian chronographers, Panodorus and Annianus, whom he believed to have misdated the incarnation of Christ because of too great a reliance on pagan scholarship, Ptolemy most of all.<sup>101</sup> Syncellus's primary chronology is according to *anni mundi*, years of the world. We have just seen that the *Chronicon Paschale* too included *annus mundi* dates as its guiding chronological principle, to which other chronologies were synchronized (something not true of Malalas, whose *annus mundi* dates cannot be made to render a coherent chronology). Syncellus, however, did not follow the *annus mundi* calculations of the *Chronicon Paschale* or what had become by the early ninth century the dominant Byzantine chronology (beginning at the equivalent of 1 September 5509 BC). Instead, Syncellus's dates follow the so-called Alexandrian chronology of Annianus (beginning on the equivalent of 25 March 5492 BC), which was used in the Syrian monasteries where the author had resided early in life.<sup>102</sup> Beginning from Eusebian chronology, but rejecting his predecessor's dates for Moses and for Christ's birth, Syncellus's own calculations placed Christ's incarnation in AM 5501 and his resurrection in AM 5534 (both variants of the chronology of Africanus), which would allow for the calculation of the *Parousia* to come.<sup>103</sup> Fully a quarter of the work is devoted to the pre-Abrahamic period, attempting to put it on a sound chronological footing, another point where Syncellus diverges from Eusebius, who regarded Abraham as the first marker from which a historically valid chronology could be

<sup>101</sup> Neither Panodorus nor Annianus wrote true chronicles, but rather lengthy chronological treatises, similar in that respect to Julius Africanus's *Chronographiae* or Syncellus himself. Though influential on both the Syriac and Ethiopic traditions (see Serruys 1913), neither of these Alexandrian chronographers has any presence in surviving Greek texts apart from Syncellus himself: see Adler and Tuffin 2002: lxiii–lxix for a summary of the evidence and Adler 1989, esp. pp. 72–105, 117–25, 160–65.

<sup>102</sup> For this chronology, which dates the Incarnation to 25 March AM 5501, the latter equated with the consuls of AD 9 — even though Syncellus still closely follows Eusebius in synchronizing it with the forty-third year of Augustus, which is 1 BC (*Ecl. chron.*, p. 381. 20) — and then compresses the reigns of the emperors between Augustus and Diocletian (only 276 years between 1 BC and AD 284 inclusive), see Grumel 1958: 85–97, Mango 1978: 16–17, and Mosshammer 2008: 198–203. The *Chronicon Paschale* seems not to have been known in Constantinople around 800 (Mango and Scott 1997: liv).

<sup>103</sup> Adler and Tuffin 2002: xxxv–xlvi.

traced.<sup>104</sup> The *annus mundi* reckoning remains the main structuring device throughout most of Syncellus's work, until the incarnation of Christ, whereupon AM dates are synchronized to years *ab incarnatione*. Throughout these sections, the text is a *mélange* of various sources, historical and chronographic, and preserves many unique fragments of Julius Africanus as well as long passages from otherwise extant authors like Eusebius; even for the Roman period, it preserves little that is not drawn from known sources. In this it is identical to Eusebius's *Chronographia*. The work ends with the first year of Diocletian, perhaps because George died without being able to settle on a more rounded conclusion, but more likely because it marked an important chronological watershed and therefore an obvious point at which to pause or make a break.<sup>105</sup> He certainly intended to continue his work further, and it seems certain that he left a great deal of unfinished research material, which Theophanes went on to use for his own *Chronographia*.

The extent to which Theophanes conducted his own research or merely put George's papers in order is thoroughly unclear, although Syncellus had a decidedly more literary style than his successor.<sup>106</sup> Be that as it may, the end result was a continuation of George's work from the accession of Diocletian to 812, or AM 6305 in his chronology, which he simply continued from Syncellus.<sup>107</sup> Theophanes' chronicle used a variety of sources, whether he or George was responsible for their compilation. Although chronicles and consularia were certainly used, so was a great variety of other historical sources, all of them broken down according to his dominant *annus mundi* chronology, not always correctly.<sup>108</sup> Even where he uses epitome histories like Malalas and classicizing historians like Theophylact Simocatta, their evidence is rigorously subjected to the annalistic chronological framework.<sup>109</sup> That framework is complex, using parallel dating systems alongside the universal *annus mundi* chronology, including years from the Incarnation; regnal years of emperors, Persian kings, and Arab caliphs; years of the great patriarchs; and

<sup>104</sup> See Chapter 3 above.

<sup>105</sup> The Alexandrian Easter cycle began with 29 August 284 and continued to be used in Coptic and Ethiopic traditions for a very long time, but more important was an 'era of Diocletian' that was used throughout the East for dating: see Bagnall and Worp 2004: 63–87.

<sup>106</sup> Kazhdan 1999: 218, *contra* Mango and Scott 1997: xcvi–c.

<sup>107</sup> The chronographic systems in Theophanes are comprehensively treated in Mango and Scott 1997: lxxiii–lxxiv, with full references.

<sup>108</sup> For Theophanes' sources, see Proudfoot 1974–75 and Mango and Scott 1997: lxxiv–xcv.

<sup>109</sup> Kazhdan 1999: 224–26 does not recognize that this is the habitual behaviour of a chronographer, thinking it an innovation of Theophanes and part of what makes him 'medieval'.

indications. These synchronisms are what place Theophanes, even more than Syncellus, squarely in the ancient Mediterranean chronicle tradition.<sup>110</sup>

That said, the scale on which Syncellus and Theophanes wrote was much larger than was normal in ancient and late antique chronicles and in consequence they lack one of the central characteristics of that ancient tradition, brevity. This had consequences. For an author, the labour involved in recording events on such a scale was heavy, and although a reader could find information in them relatively easily — much more easily than in a normal narrative text at least, and more easily in Theophanes than Syncellus — works like those of Syncellus and Theophanes did not allow one to grasp history *uno in conspectu* the way an ancient chronicle did. This is particularly true for Syncellus, as anyone who has tried to track down information in the Greek, or even in the English, text without an index can attest. For those reasons, Theophanes in particular became an important source for later Byzantine authors who at the same time abandoned the precision of his chronology and its synchronisms, while drawing solely on the voluminous information he contained.<sup>111</sup> He also found continuators, in more or less four stages, writing on a reign-by-reign basis and bringing the chronicle down to the year 961.<sup>112</sup> There is no need to treat Theophanes' successors, whether those who continued him or those who used him; many of their works are conventionally known as chronicles, but they all abandon the rigorous chronographic apparatus that places Theophanes in the ancient tradition. Moreover, they are on such a scale that they bear very little relationship to the short, paratactic, and annalistic productions of antiquity; they

<sup>110</sup> Mango and Scott 1997: lii: Theophanes is 'one of the numerous descendants of the *Chronicon* of Eusebios and is, in fact, as regards the Greek-speaking world, the last in that tradition'.

<sup>111</sup> Those works that used Theophanes heavily include some of the longest and most widely diffused works of Byzantine historiography: George the Monk (Moravcsik 1958: 277–80 and Hunger 1978: I, 347–51), Symeon the Logothete (Hunger 1978: I, 354–57), Scylitzes (ed. Thurn 1973; Moravcsik 1958: 335–41, and Hunger 1978: I, 389–93), Cedrenus (Moravcsik 1958: 273–75 and Hunger 1978: I, 393–94), and Iohannes Zonaras (Moravcsik 1958: 344–48 and Hunger 1978: I, 416–19). With the late ninth-century Latin translation of Anastasius Bibliothecarius, on whom see Wattenbach and others 1952–90: IV, 465–67, material from Theophanes re-entered the western tradition of ecclesiastical history (the translation is also important for textual history, since Anastasius was a very literal translator and his oldest manuscripts are older than the earliest surviving Greek manuscript).

<sup>112</sup> Hunger 1978: I, 339–43. The CSHB edition of Theophanes Continuatus is very deficient. A new edition of book five has just appeared (Ševčenko 2011), while the remainder of the text (I–IV and VI) is in the hands of J. M. Featherstone and J. Signes Codoñer. Genesis (Hunger 1978: I, 351–54) also continued Theophanes down to 886.

instead represent a medieval Greek tradition of universal history writing in which the goal of encompassing the history of the world down to an author's time was far removed from the chronographic impulse of the ancient chronicle tradition.<sup>113</sup>

### The So-Called *Kleinchroniken*

Given the scale on which Syncellus and Theophanes wrote — both reproducing many large excerpts from ecclesiastical histories and other non-chronicle sources as well as reproducing chronicle and consularia notices — and also given the still larger scale of later universal chronicles inspired by them, it should come as no surprise that at more or less the same time as Theophanes was writing in the ninth century, there should have arisen a new vogue for *breviaria*. This provided the major inspiration for later Byzantine writing, and Theophanes was himself abridged in the tenth century.<sup>114</sup> The most important work in this epitomizing tradition is the *Ἱστορία σύντομος* ('Short History', Latinized as *Breuiarium*), written by the churchman Nicephorus before he became patriarch (806–15) of Constantinople.<sup>115</sup> Nicephorus's book was an epitome history, not a chronicle, running from 602 to 769, and he also wrote what is called the *Χρονογραφικὸν σύντομον* (*Abridged Chronography*), which was a compilation of ecclesiastical and regnal lists, not a chronicle or a history; what is more, the attribution may be pseudepigraphic, since it is only attributed to Nicephorus in some manuscripts.<sup>116</sup> The *Breuiarium* is extant in two versions whose

<sup>113</sup> Theophanes therefore stands both at the very end of the late antique chronicle tradition and at the start of the Byzantine 'world chronicle' tradition, not just those listed above in note 111, but also still later ones like Constantine Manasses (Moravcsik 1958: 353–54 and Hunger 1978: I, 419–22), who wrote a highly anecdotal work from Adam to 1081 in verse; Michael Glycas (Moravcsik 1958: 430–32 and Hunger 1978: I, 422–26), whose work ran from Creation to 1118; and Joel (Moravcsik 1958: 348–49 and Hunger 1978: I, 476) and Theodorus Scutariotes (Moravcsik 1958: 526–28 and Hunger 1978: I, 477–78), the last of the Byzantine universal historians, running down to 1204 and 1261 respectively. The verse chronicle of Ephraim (Moravcsik 1958: 256–57 and Hunger 1978: I, 478–80) deals solely with Roman history, down to 1261. Perhaps rather oddly, the closest ancient analogue to these middle and late Byzantine chronicles is the vast compilation of Diodorus Siculus.

<sup>114</sup> Wilson 1975: 13–14, Mango 1975: 35–37, and Yannopoulos 1989. For an epitomized chronicle of c. 854 in Vatican Library, MS Vat. gr. 2210, which stands in uncertain relationship to both Syncellus and Theophanes, see Ševčenko 1992: 284–87.

<sup>115</sup> Moravcsik 1958: 456–58, Hunger 1978: I, 344–47, and Kazhdan 1999: 211–15. On Nicephorus's life, see Alexander 1958.

<sup>116</sup> Ed. by de Boor, with the brief overview in Mango 1990: 2–4.

contents are identical, but whose stylistic differences represent authorial revisions. Nicephorus's working method seems to have been to take information from simple chronicle sources and rewrite them into high-flown classicizing language, thus producing a work whose untaxing historical content could be read as literature. It was heavily used in George the Monk's universal history ('world chronicle' to Byzantinists) and also went on to inspire other short chronicles and *breviaria*, many of which, like the so-called *Chronicon Bruxellense*, are referred to as chronicles when they are in fact *breviaria* or rather epitomes, since they derived most of their content from pre-existing works.<sup>117</sup> Another chronicle, transmitted in the same manuscript as the *Chronicon Paschale* and attributed to the so-called Μεγάς Χρονογράφος ('Great Chronographer'), was written around the time of Theophanes and Nicephorus.<sup>118</sup> Fifteen or eighteen fragments — scholars disagree on how they should be numbered — are preserved in the tenth-century manuscript of the *Chronicon Paschale*, added in an eleventh-century hand to the margins and three blank folios. Although it is possible that this Great Chronographer wrote towards the end of the eighth century and was a common source for Theophanes and Nicephorus, it is also possible that the entries were derived from an epitomized combination of those authors used to annotate the manuscript of the *Chronicon Paschale*. Given that the precise structure of this 'great chronicle' also remains obscure, we do no more than note its existence here.<sup>119</sup>

<sup>117</sup> For the *Chronicon Bruxellense*, see Moravcsik 1958: 233. This is also true of the many short chronicles listed as 'Chronica Byzantina' in Moravcsik 1958: 233–35, some of which are untreated by any more recent writers. See for example, the Χρονικὸν ἐπιτομὸν and the *Anonymus Matritensis*. These works are hard to classify since their content can change quite considerably from page to page and even reign to reign: from full accounts of emperors as we find in *breviaria* like the Latin *Epitome de caesaribus* to just a sentence per reign like the chronicle epitomes of Isidore or Bede to empty lists of names with no annotation at all beyond the length of the reign. The important point to note, however, is that there is no interest in chronology at all in these works, no running chronology or even a summary at the beginning or end. The *Chronicle* of Peter of Alexandria (Samodurova 1961), for instance, is a vigorously epitomized version of a larger-scale world chronicle from Adam to 912, with virtually all the chronographic apparatus excised. Another heavily epitomized history from Aeneas to 1323 survives in Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, MS Hist. gr. 99 (Hunger 1978: I, 476–77).

<sup>118</sup> Schreiner 1975: 37–45 and Schreiner 1977: 44. The text is transmitted in MS Vat. gr. 1941, fols 241<sup>v</sup>–242<sup>v</sup> and 272<sup>v</sup>, with derivative excerpts of no independent value in a Stockholm manuscript. The fifteen or eighteen notices run from AM 5985 (= 477) to AM 6258 (= 750) and are also edited with the *Chronicon Paschale*, I, 694–95 and in Whitby 1983a: 17–20.

<sup>119</sup> For the source for Theophanes and Nicephorus, see Speck 1988: 499–519, Whitby 1983a, Whitby 1983b, and Whitby 1992: 66–67. Cf. the plausible doubts in Mango 1990: 17–18, Mango and Scott 1997: xc–xci, and Kazhdan 1999: 214.

Nicephorus's *Breviarium* on the one hand and the great 'world chronicles' on the other represent the general parameters within which the Middle Byzantine historiographical tradition grew up; during the so-called 'Macedonian Renaissance' of the tenth century one also finds other very different genres flourishing, not least the great excerpts of Constantine Porphyrogenitus and the patriarch Photius, which between them preserve so many of the Greek authors to have survived in fragments from late antiquity.<sup>120</sup> Several further contemporary histories, whether written as continuations of a world chronicle or not, are also extant from the period.<sup>121</sup> But in the late Byzantine period, a whole new tradition of Byzantine short chronicles appeared, which are referred to as *βραχέα χρονικά* or *Kleinchroniken* in the modern scholarship to distinguish them from the *chronica minora* of late antiquity.<sup>122</sup> The *Kleinchroniken* share many of the characteristics of the late antique chronicle tradition — in particular the primacy of chronographic structure over narrative content, their brevity, and a paratactic style of reportage — but as a group, they have no apparent direct descent from the late antique works.<sup>123</sup> The main type of *Kleinchronik* is an annalistic, year-by-year account, sometimes edited or continued by multiple hands.<sup>124</sup> In the standard corpus of 110 *Kleinchroniken*, the texts are classified by type and content, the most important group of which is the *Reichschroniken*, which is to say those that concern the events of the whole empire.<sup>125</sup> These are not always easy to distinguish from *Kaiserchroniken*, or imperial chronicles, since if one looks at the evidence, the emperors are central to both this

<sup>120</sup> In general, see Moravcsik 1958: 356–90, Hunger 1978: I, 360–67, and Toynbee 1973.

<sup>121</sup> For example, Leo Diaconus (Moravcsik 1958: 398–400 and Hunger 1978: I, 367–72), Michael Psellus (Moravcsik 1958: 437–41 and Hunger 1978: I, 372–82), and Michael Attaleiates (Moravcsik 1958: 427–29 and Hunger 1978: I, 383–89).

<sup>122</sup> See Moravcsik 1958: 235–38, Hunger 1978: I, 481–82, and Schreiner 1977: 38–40. The name *βραχέα χρονικά* appears in no manuscript, where these works are usually untitled but occasionally called such things as *χρονικὸν ἐν συντόμῳ*, *χρονικὸν μερικόν*, *χρονογραφικόν*, *χρονογραφίον*, *χρονογραφία*, *σύνοψις χρονική*, *διήγησις*, *ἐνθύμησις*, and *ιστορία* (on these, see Appendix 1 below). Schreiner 1975 is the modern edition. See also Moravcsik 1958: 235–37.

<sup>123</sup> Although it is useful to have the critical edition of the 'Great Chronographer' in Schreiner 1975: 37–45, the text does not actually belong in the company of the late Byzantine *Kleinchroniken* contained in the rest of the edition.

<sup>124</sup> Schreiner 1975: 22 distinguishes among full independent chronicles of the sort we are familiar with in this volume, short chronicles covering single imperial reigns, personal chronicles or jottings put together by one person in the course of his life, and notices compiled after the fact to fill in gaps on blank leaves of manuscripts.

<sup>125</sup> Schreiner 1975, nos 2–13.



and the former category.<sup>126</sup> Other categories include regional and city chronicles, like those of Thessalonica, Mesembria, and so on, while there are very numerous short chronicles of the Ottoman conquests.<sup>127</sup> The fourteenth-century *Chronicle of the Morea* is an odd and interesting hybrid, a work of Frankish patriotism possibly first composed in vernacular Greek, and now extant in Greek, French, Aragonese, and Italian versions, though the priority of the Greek and French texts remains disputed.<sup>128</sup> Isolated chronicles, none related to others and often narrow in their focus, make up another large part of the known corpus, and while these are often personal or linked to specific families, many take up the familiar topics of natural disasters, celestial phenomena, and so on.<sup>129</sup> The dating systems of these *Kleinchroniken* differ, and while a few use a universal chronology (in forms such as 'ἔτους (number)' or 'τῷ (number) ἔτει' ('in year X')), many perpetuate the indiction system, with the formula 'ἰνδικτιῶνος (number) + event' reminiscent of the role that the *His consulibus* formula played in the old consularia. Nicephorus's *Breuiarium* seems to have been the inspiration for, or the starting point of, many of these texts, some of which are transmitted together with it in manuscripts. As a group, the *Kleinchroniken* tend to be transmitted not in the company of major historical works, but rather in miscellanies. They also tend to occur only in very late manuscripts, with just six known before the fourteenth century, a substantial number dating to the fourteenth century itself, and the vast majority dating to the second half of the fifteenth century or later, which is to say, after the fall of Constantinople to the Turks.<sup>130</sup> Sources are so poorly known that precisely how the evidence of the *Kleinchroniken* should fit in amongst other sources of their period is often impossible to judge.

These Byzantine *Kleinchroniken* coexisted with a more or less flourishing tradition of history writing in the Byzantine East. Works like the Σύνοψις ἱστοριῶν (*Epitome of Histories*) of the *curopalates* and *drongarius* John Scylitzes, who died at the very beginning of the twelfth century, could run from the death of

<sup>126</sup> Schreiner 1975, nos 14–22.

<sup>127</sup> Local and regional chronicles: Schreiner 1975: nos 23–52; chronicles of the Turkish conquests, *ibid.*, nos 53–80.

<sup>128</sup> See Schmitt 1904, and briefly Beck 1971: 157–59 and Moravcsik 1958: 238–39.

<sup>129</sup> Schreiner 1975: nos 81–109.

<sup>130</sup> Schreiner 1977: 32–37. Only six chronicles are transmitted along with literary histories like those of Pachymeres or Zonaras, while only one manuscript, Cod. Olympiossa 189 (Olympiotissa Monastery, Ellassona, Greece), is dedicated more or less exclusively to collecting this type of work.

Nicephorus I to Michael VI (811–1057), but it did so in the manner of Michael Psellus, which is to say, in a high literary style, organized around imperial reigns.<sup>131</sup>

To sum up the evidence for chronicles in Byzantium, one might say that just as the Carolingian period brought a new wave of true chronicles to the West, so in Byzantium the revival of imperial government in the ninth century, and particularly the Macedonian renaissance of the tenth, created or re-created the historical genres that would continue until the end of the Byzantine Empire. The works of Syncellus and Theophanes are pivotal, for though they stand at a very late stage in the ancient chronicling tradition, their scale also inspired the vast universal histories so typical of Middle and Late Byzantine literature and usually described as world chronicles by Byzantinists.<sup>132</sup> Unlike Theophanes, whose work is still recognizable as being in the ancient tradition, the *Kleinchroniken* reflect a new and local historiographic development, their scantiness and strange mixture of unconnected details representing not so much authorial intentions as the breakdown of Byzantine control and a concomitant narrowing of sources of information.<sup>133</sup> In that respect, the authors of the *Kleinchroniken* were just like the late ancient chroniclers we discussed in Chapter 5, jotting down whatever things happened to come to their attention in the remote corners of the shrinking empire they inhabited. Just as the historiographic tradition of the West experienced a major break in the period between the sixth century, when Gregory of Tours wrote, and the beginning of the eleventh, when history on a grand scale began to be written again, with only chronicles and epitome histories filling the gaps, so too in Byzantium history on any scale experienced a similar gap. In the West, the great upturn in chronicle writing under the Carolingians was very much a response to the Anglo-Saxon and Irish example at which we have already looked.

<sup>131</sup> See Thurn 1973: vii–xi for Scylitzes's life. Other important exponents of the genre are John Cinnamus (Moravcsik 1958: 324–28 and Hunger 1978: I, 409–16), Nicetas Choniates (Moravcsik 1958: 444–50 and Hunger 1978: I, 429–41), George Acropolites (Moravcsik 1958: 266–68 and Hunger 1978: I, 442–47), George Pachymeres (Moravcsik 1958: 280–82 and Hunger 1978: I, 447–53), and Nicephorus Gregoras (Moravcsik 1958: 450–53 and Hunger 1978: I, 453–65).

<sup>132</sup> See notes 111–13 above for references.

<sup>133</sup> In the same sort of environment and at the very end of the Byzantine period, new annalistic works began to be produced again, for instance in the work of Michael Panaretos, whose local chronicle of Trebizond is essentially a late medieval version of the sorts of obscure local chronicles that we find in the earlier period.

*Early Medieval Chronicles on the Continent*

For all the misinformation about the chronicle that R. L. Poole was responsible for disseminating among medievalists, he was not incorrect in believing Bede to be a second founder of the western chronicle tradition.<sup>134</sup> In both Spain and the Frankish world, it is difficult to discern a continuous chronicle tradition from antiquity to the Carolingian era. In Spain, the ancient tradition was more or less extinct by the middle of the seventh century, and Isidore's chronicle epitome, though it inspired Bede and the Irish tradition, found no Spanish continuators; in Francia, chronicling fell into abeyance after the sixth century along with so much else, while Gregory of Tours's *Historiae* represents a unique example of secular narrative history from the medieval West. The popularity of Bede's *De temporum ratione*, brought to the Continent in the packs of Anglo-Saxon churchmen, helped spur a renaissance of historical writing. At least one extant universal chronicle epitome is known from Frankish Gaul as a direct continuation of Bede, and it was in turn combined with a post-Carolingian chronicle miscellany in the tenth century to form what is known as the *Chronicon uniuersale*.<sup>135</sup> The number of Carolingian products begins to rise precipitately in the eighth century, and as we have already seen in the Greek East, it is likely that the rise of a powerful new dynasty, in this case that of the Pippinids or Carolingians, was the main inspiration for it. For while there can be no doubt that the Frankish kingdoms were the most dynamic and powerful western polities in the West between the fall of the empire and the eighth century, the disordered Merovingian realm experienced the same general hiatus in the composition of historical works as did much of the post-imperial world. Certainly the late antique chronicle tradition is invisible in Francia until after the rise of the Carolingians to political prominence, while the genre's widespread efflorescence in the later eighth and ninth centuries corresponds quite closely with what is universally called the Carolingian Renaissance.<sup>136</sup>

The importance of that phenomenon is unquestionable, and its nature a perpetual topic of scholarship.<sup>137</sup> The vigorous efforts at uniting Frankish lands and

<sup>134</sup> Poole 1926: 27.

<sup>135</sup> MGH SS, 13: 1–19 = Mommsen 1898: 336–40, from Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, MS Clm. 246. See Wattenbach and others 1952–90: II, 260.

<sup>136</sup> Useful orientation in the modern literature is provided by Schneider 2001, Fried 2008, and Jakobs 1999.

<sup>137</sup> Wattenbach and others 1952–90: II, 193–203, Brunhölzl 1975, Riché 1979, McKitterick 1994, and Colish 1997.

conquering Frankish neighbours, which was undertaken by Pippin III and Charlemagne, brought with them a powerful motive for the standardization of politics and administration. Whether this was any more successful than the drive to uniformity visible in the Tetrarchic and Constantinian empires is a moot point.<sup>138</sup>

The aspiration to conformity, however, is in some ways more important than its achievement, at least in cultural terms: the explosion of writing under the Carolingians, beginning at the end of the eighth century when scriptoria were founded at many monasteries that had previously lacked them, went on to preserve much of what we still have of the ancient literary heritage. Latin historians — Ammianus, Dares Phrygius, Epiphanius Scholasticus, Eusebius-Rufinus, Eutropius, Frontinus, Caesar's *Gallic War*, the Latin Josephus, Justin's epitome of Trogus, much of the extant Livy, Orosius, Quintus Curtius, Sallust, the *Historia Augusta*, Tacitus's *Annales* 1–6, *Agricola*, and *Germania*, and Velleius's Tiberian narrative — were all copied and transmitted to us by Carolingian scribes, usually working from late antique exemplars.<sup>139</sup> As canonical works, the textual tradition of such authors was relatively stable as far as Carolingian authors were concerned. More labile texts like late ancient chronicles were likewise copied in the Carolingian period — Jerome and Prosper among them — but were necessarily more prone to interpolation, excerpting, alteration, and continuation.

That said, however, although the generic distinctions between history and chronicle continued to be observed, Carolingian scriptoria often copied the two sorts of work in the same manuscripts, in clear contradistinction from the Byzantine East where chronicles tended to be copied in miscellanies and among technical treatises, not alongside literary histories. It may be that, with less of a classical sense for the proper place of different genres, the Carolingians preferred to include chronicles and histories side-by-side in order to provide complete historical coverage over time. So it is that we sometimes find true chronicles, with full annalistic apparatus, alongside chronicle epitomes like Bede's, *breviaria* like Eutropius's and Fredegar's, and full narrative histories like Gregory's.<sup>140</sup> Unsurprisingly, the copying of so many

<sup>138</sup> See Wickham 2005 for the fundamental need to study the political, economic, and cultural life of the late Roman and post-imperial periods at a local rather than a national level, and McKitterick 2008 makes a good case for the essentially local and ad hoc basis of Charlemagne's imperial reforms.

<sup>139</sup> In general, Reynolds and Wilson 1991: 92–109, with reference *sub nomine* to Reynolds 1983 for most of the authors mentioned here.

<sup>140</sup> St Omer 706 and St Omer 697 originally formed a single manuscript containing Eutropius (epitome history), Marcellinus *comes* (chronicle), the *Notitia Galliarum* (geographical catalogue),

classic texts also sparked contemporary writing in every genre, chronicles again included. That is to say, as a canon of necessary Christian and, to a lesser extent, classical texts was created to serve the needs of the aggressively literate Carolingian establishment, so too were personal quiddities indulged: this could involve the copying of more obscure texts (the poetry of Catullus comes to mind), but it could also mean increasingly creative ways of recording contemporary history.<sup>141</sup>

This Carolingian Renaissance was very significant for the future of European historiography, and not just in Francia. Pippin and Charlemagne between them conquered a very large part of Europe, and where the Franks went, Frankish ways of doing things were superimposed upon local post-imperial traditions — Alemannic, Lombard, Visigothic — or created from the ground up, in regions like Saxony that had been neither part of the Roman Empire nor shaped into a post-Roman polity prior to the Carolingian conquest. The immense cultural prestige associated with Charles the Great and the intellectuals and churchmen of his court also provided inspiring patterns for regions that were not actually incorporated into the Frankish Empire, for instance Scandinavia or the Slavic kingdoms in Bohemia, Moravia, and Poland. The flowering of various historiographical genres under the Carolingians, along with most other Frankish cultural exports, therefore came to serve as models for the High Middle Ages, as did the Carolingian habit of treating books and other cultural works as forms of material wealth or treasure.<sup>142</sup> The Carolingian era witnessed the beginnings of new genres like *libri memoriales*, *libri uitae*, or the *gesta episcoporum* modelled after the Roman *Liber pontificalis*, which circulated extensively in the period. It likewise saw the vast expansion of quasi-historical genres like hagiography and the re-creation of long-lost genres like secular biography (derived from the rediscovery of Suetonius), first in the shape of Einhard's *Vita Karoli*, and then in the lives of Louis the Pious by Thegan and the so-called Astronomer.<sup>143</sup> *Res*

Gregory of Tours (history), Fredegar including book four and continuations (epitome history), excerpts from Bede (chronicle epitome), the *Annales Regni Francorum* (chronicle), the *Annales Bertiniani* (chronicle), and perhaps the *Chronicon Laurissense breue* (chronicle) and the *Annales Vedastini* (chronicle). For this, see McKitterick 2004: 50–51.

<sup>141</sup> McKitterick 1989: 165–210 synthesizes a great deal of important evidence to this effect.

<sup>142</sup> For the Carolingian innovation by which books were transformed into a form of wealth that was portable and prestigious, see McKitterick 1989: 135–64.

<sup>143</sup> See, generally, Wattenbach and others 1952–90: I, 64–66 for *libri memoriales* and *uitae*, with Ganshof 1970. See McKitterick 2004: 162–73 on the former, Bautier 1970: 810–16 for the *gesta episcoporum*, Wattenbach and others 1952–90: I, 119–46 and II, 165–79 for the saints' lives, and *ibid.*: II, 273–80 and III, 329–38 for biography.

*gestae* of the sort written by Ammianus also reappeared in the Carolingian period with Nithard's classicizing and pessimistic *Historiae*.<sup>144</sup>

In amongst all this activity, what look very much like chronicles on the late antique model were revived on a vast scale. As we saw in the first chapter, the need for a technical word to describe these very bare records — sometimes year-by-year, sometimes not, but always on a scale very much smaller than the large late medieval productions that medievalists are accustomed to call chronicles — led to the adoption of the word 'annals' to describe them, in spite of the lack of medieval evidence for the use of this word in this or related contexts. From this invention, there arose a whole variety of false problems having to do with the generic distinction of 'chronicle' and 'annals' that is still too frequently belaboured. What we would emphasize here is the way in which so-called Frankish 'annals' conform generically to the very old Mediterranean tradition of chronicle writing: with their brevity, annalistic structure, lack of fixed beginning and end points, and paratactic style, the chronicles of the Frankish period look very much as did their ultimate ancestors in the Ancient Near East.

### 'Fredegar' and Other Frankish *Breviaria*

The direct forebear of the Carolingian historiographical tradition is the so-called chronicle of 'Fredegar' or, more clumsily, Pseudo-Fredegar. This is not actually a chronicle, but rather a moderately extensive epitome history. It can be analysed either as one work with multiple authors and multiple continuators or as two separate works, one partly dependent on the other and both largely composed of borrowings from earlier authors. It is worth giving some thought to the Fredegar problem, for it illustrates many of the difficulties of nomenclature that one faces in discussing chronicles after the transition from antiquity to the Middle Ages. The attribution to Fredegar first occurs in the sixteenth century, and there was almost certainly never any single 'Fredegar' or indeed any single author whatever his name. Although the transmitted text does include epitomes of true chronicles like Jerome and Hydatius, it is really not a chronicle in the ancient sense of the term.<sup>145</sup> Nor,

<sup>144</sup> See Ganshof 1970: 652–55 for the apt Ammianus comparison.

<sup>145</sup> R. Collins 1996: 81: the attribution to 'Fredegar' appears in an annotation to one of the manuscripts of the text (Bibliothèque d'agglomération de Saint-Omer, MS 706, fol. 118) and in Fauchet's *Recueil des Antiquitez Gauloises et Françaises* of 1579, though it is impossible to know whether the print or the manuscript authority came first.

however, is it a chronicle epitome like its rough contemporaries Isidore and Bede, but rather an epitome history — that is, one compiled by ‘cutting and pasting’ together extant texts — its narrative structured primarily by the events of successive reigns, rather than by a dominant annalistic chronological frame. Although it was long believed that the work attributed to Fredegar was the work of several different seventh-century authors, later heavily revised and continued by a number of others in the middle decades of the eighth century, a more economical approach has recently been suggested.<sup>146</sup> This detects two fundamentally separate works, one of the seventh century and one of the eighth. The first was quite probably the work of a single author and composed no earlier than 660.<sup>147</sup> The second was the work of at least two authors, working on either side of the fateful year 751 (see below) and reflecting a very clearly Carolingian perspective. That the seventh-century version was the work of a single author, and not of at least three compilers as has usually been argued, is suggested by the way in which the epitomes of Eusebius-Jerome and Hydatius were deliberately shaped to complement the themes emphasized in the fully original portions of the work, that is to say, the ninety chapters conventionally known as the chronicle’s ‘book four’.<sup>148</sup> The eighth-century version is both longer and quite different, not just a universal history, but a universal history with a very specifically Frankish focus. Although once classified as a late version of ‘Fredegar’ with continuations, this eighth-century *Historia uel Gesta Francorum* should, it seems, be regarded as a new work, associated with the Frankish counts Childebrand and Nibelung, an interpretation supported by the manuscript tradition.<sup>149</sup> A colophon preserved in MS Vaticanus Reg. lat. 213 from

<sup>146</sup> By R. Collins 2007, which is in many places a verbatim German translation of the English text that appeared in R. Collins 1996, but which expands on many points of detail and, importantly, puts forward the logical but radical thesis of two fundamentally different works, a seventh-century ‘Fredegar’ and an eighth-century *Historia uel Gesta Francorum*, on which see the useful comments of Goffart 2009. The MGH edition of Krusch is fundamentally sound, as is the edition of the traditional ‘book four’ in J. M. Wallace-Hadrill 1960, although Collins argues persuasively that the eighth-century compilation that he regards as a separate work — but which Krusch relegated to the apparatus as a mere revision and continuation — should be re-edited in its own right.

<sup>147</sup> The basic consideration of the contents can be found in J. M. Wallace-Hadrill 1960: x–xii, R. Collins 1996: 85–86, and R. Collins 2007: 25–38. The contents of the seventh-century text are set out in ‘Chapter 6, note 147’ of the Appendices to the Footnotes, p. 377 below.

<sup>148</sup> A discussion of the modern chapter and book divisions can be found in ‘Chapter 6, note 148’ in the Appendices to the Footnotes, pp. 377–78 below.

<sup>149</sup> The traditional classification can be found in Krusch 1882: 495–515, summarized in Wattenbach and others 1952–90: I, 109–13 and II, 161–63, and Ganshof 1970: 644–45. However,

the year 751 (and absent but represented by blank lines in other manuscripts), attributes the preceding material to the impetus of Count Childebrand (uncle or cousin of Pippin III) and the succeeding material, running to 768, to the authority of Count Nibelung, son of Childebrand. The *Historia uel gesta Francorum* was therefore an early product of the Carolingian dynasty's rise to power, something made still clearer by its incorporation of chapters forty-three to fifty-three of a late Merovingian work, the so-called *Liber historiae Francorum*, which is, like 'Fredegar', often wrongly described as a chronicle.<sup>150</sup> This *breviarium* was a short history of the Franks, written at St Denis or Soissons in 726/27 and giving Frankish history a firm foundation in the classical past by providing it with Trojan origins. The Childebrand/Nibelung *Historia uel gesta Francorum*, which includes additional Trojan material, thus compiles an omnibus history of the world that turned all the then-extant texts of Frankish history into a single version that made Pippin III and his sons the culmination of the Frankish past.<sup>151</sup>

The 'Fredegar' compilation, the *Liber historiae Francorum*, and the *Historia uel gesta Francorum* are not chronicles, not even chronicle epitomes on the model of Isidore or Bede. They lack any universal chronographic framework and are organized, like late antique *breviaria*, by reign with little or no regard for regnal years. The reckoning of historical time that lay at the base of the ancient chronicle tradition is not visible here. Nevertheless, we have devoted considerable space to these

R. Collins 2007: 96–130 demonstrates that there are no manuscripts that contain both the materials included in the seventh-century compilation and all or any of the continuations from 642 to 768, while the book divisions of the eighth-century *Historia uel gesta* are also completely different from the various seventh-century versions. The case from the manuscripts for this being a work new in both conception and practice is very strong indeed, as is demonstrated in 'Chapter 6, note 149' of the Appendices to the Footnotes, p. 378 below.

<sup>150</sup> For the *Liber historiae Francorum* in general, see Wattenbach and others 1952–90: I, 114–16, Ganshof 1970: 642–44, and Gerberding 1987. The first four chapters of this *breviarium* describe the very early origins of the Franks and insert a portion of the prologue to the *Lex Salica*, followed by an epitome of Gregory of Tours's first six books that is substantially different from that in the seventh-century Fredegar compilation; chapters thirty-six to fifty-three cover the period between 584 and 727, the presumed date of composition. The focus in both the original and epitomized sections is firmly on the western Frankish kingdom of Neustria, but the effect of the whole compilation is to provide not just an origin myth that places the Franks within universal history, but rather an origin and history of the Franks.

<sup>151</sup> Thus many of Charles Martel's campaigns within the Frankish kingdoms are suppressed in order to concentrate on foreign victories, while the very existence of the Merovingian Childerich III is omitted.



texts because they represent, in a very real sense, the beginning of a fully medieval historiography in the Frankish world, and thus of medieval European historiography more generally. Although a great deal of nonsense has been written about a non-existent ancient genre of *origines gentium*, usually to support the dogma of ethnogenesis and medieval state formation, it is true that the Carolingian Franks had a clear interest in codifying the origins and customs of the peoples who were brought under Frankish hegemony.<sup>152</sup> A sense of the importance of Frankishness as such — and of delineating what was not Frankish in order to better define what was — is indisputably part of the Carolingian mindset. The versions of Frankish *origines* provided in the *Liber historiae Francorum* and the *Historia uel gesta* soon came to be associated with other, generically dissimilar, works by Isidore, Bede, and Jordanes, and no doubt inspired the Carolingian account of Lombard history by Paul the Deacon. For their role in inspiring this novel, Frankish conception of writing about the past, the three epitome histories at which we have been looking represent the birth of medieval historiography in the Frankish world, whereas Gregory of Tours, in his vast, complicated narrative, is a sort of last gasp of classicizing history, however unrecognizable to the classicist it may be.

Yet all the same, none of these distinctly Frankish works is anything like a true chronicle: that genre only reappears towards the latter part of Charlemagne's reign, part of the general efflorescence of historical culture of the time and no doubt inspired by the same needs that worked upon late antiquity: whereas *breviaria* like the *Liber historiae Francorum* could be read rapidly with some measure of literary pleasure and a vast compendium like the *Historia uel gesta* placed the Franks at the centre of universal history, neither could provide a quick grasp of the historical past, distant or recent, *uno in conspectu*. That was always a function of the chronicle form, and it should come as no surprise that it reappears in so dynamic a period of Frankish expansion as was the later eighth century.

### The *Annales regni Francorum* and Other Frankish Chronicles

The first real Carolingian chronicle is the *Annales regni Francorum*.<sup>153</sup> Unlike any previous product of the Merovingian or Carolingian milieu, the *Annales regni*

<sup>152</sup> Hence the Carolingian sponsorship of so many barbarian law codes, the practical application of which is impossible to vouchsafe.

<sup>153</sup> MGH SS, 1: 124–218 and Kurze 1895. There is a serviceable English translation in Scholz 1970: 37–125.

*Francorum* is a true chronicle insofar as it is structured not by reign, historical events, or narrative arc, but rather in the first instance by the passage of time year-by-year and in its paratactic setting forth of each event within each year. However, its bulk is far beyond what is found in any previous extant chronicle, and that bulk precludes any sense of history *uno in conspectu*. In a sense what we have is a *breuiarium*-type history structured like a chronicle. Its precise inspiration is impossible to discern, but unlike other Frankish chronicles of the same period, the *Annales regni Francorum* does not represent annotated or worked-up Easter tables. Within the Frankish milieu, the *Annales regni Francorum* represents a real historiographical innovation, but that it is a Frankish invention, or even a historiographical revolution, is patently false.<sup>154</sup> It is merely the redeployment, in a contemporary context, of the true chronicle mode of late antiquity, chiefly that of Jerome and Prosper, who were widely disseminated in Carolingian Francia and provided the obvious model for annalistic chronicling, in contrast to a historiography structured by reigns.

The *Annales regni Francorum* was christened as such by Leopold von Ranke, who suggested the name in place of the older *Annales Laurissenses maiores* (other Lorsch chronicles have retained their names). Surviving in thirty-nine manuscripts, classified in five families, the *Annales* begins with the death of Charles Martel in 741 and continues to 829, when continuations begin to diverge in content, among them the most important ninth-century chronicles, the *Annals of St Bertin* and the *Annals of Fulda*. The precise origins of the *Annales regni Francorum* remain disputed: traditional German *Quellenforschung* presumed that it was cobbled together from a variety of local sources at the Carolingian court.<sup>155</sup> More recently, scholars have tended to favour the older view of the *Annales* as an original compilation, first put together after 780 at Charlemagne's court, and providing a base text from which other local chronicles, a few still extant, made excerpts which were then adapted with reference to events of purely local importance.<sup>156</sup> In the 790s and early 800s, the entries in the *Annales* may represent continuous contemporary compilation or a series of periodic datings, but the identity of the authors has baffled the efforts of Carolingianists eager to attribute the text to one or another of the luminaries in Charlemagne's circle. This absence of a clear-cut authorial presence is a useful reminder of the essential generic difference between chronicle

<sup>154</sup> Pace McKitterick 2004: 97–119.

<sup>155</sup> Wattenbach and others 1952–90: II, 245–58.

<sup>156</sup> McKitterick 2004: 101–11, following Halphen 1921: 3–15.

and narrative history, whether epitomizing or classicizing.<sup>157</sup> But that the *Annales* was a court production, much concerned with the achievements of Charlemagne and his family, is not in doubt.

As a continuous text, preserved in multiple recensions, the *Annales regni Francorum* runs until 829, before splitting into multiple and unrelated trajectories.<sup>158</sup> As noted above, two continuations are particularly important, the *Annales Bertiniani* (*Annals of St Bertin*) and the *Annales Fuldenses* (*Annals of Fulda*). As extant, the Neustrian *Annales Bertiniani* is a ninth-century work running from 830 to 882, with several phases of contemporary compilation, two of which can be attributed to important Carolingian writers.<sup>159</sup> Until 835, like most chronicles, the *Annales Bertiniani* must remain anonymous in the face of even the most ingenious investigation, but from 835 to 861 we know that the work was compiled by the Spanish refugee bishop Prudentius of Troyes. Thereafter, the devoted controversialist Hincmar of Reims, one of the Carolingian world's most prolific authors and a staunch champion of Charles the Bald, carried the compilation forward to 882.<sup>160</sup> The *Annales Bertiniani* ranges all across the Carolingian world and far beyond it, and at least during the period of Hincmar's authorship was compiled year-by-year and not retrospectively.<sup>161</sup> In the eastern kingdom of Austrasia, the *Annales Bertiniani* finds its counterpart in the *Annales Fuldenses*, which carries on to 887 and in some versions as far as 901. The manuscript tradition of this text is large and diverse and has posed major problems of interpretation since the first critical edition in the nineteenth century. The section on the rise of the Carolingians is a fairly heavily edited and altered version of the *Annales regni Francorum*. Thereafter, there is evidence for composition in stages, beginning in 829, which were in the past attributed to named authors — Einhard (829–38), Rudolf of Fulda (839–63), and Meginhard of Fulda (864–82) — though this is now less confidently asserted. The five-year

<sup>157</sup> See, e.g., Hoffmann 1958. Because parts of the *Annales* do indeed echo parts of Einhard's biography of Charlemagne, it was once assumed that Einhard was their author, but this is no longer at all clear.

<sup>158</sup> The older literature on all the early 'Frankish annals' is given in Wattenbach and others 1952–90: II, 180–92.

<sup>159</sup> Ed. MGH SS, I: 419–515, Waitz 1883, and Grat and others 1964. The *Annales Bertiniani* has no connection with the monastery of St Bertin save that the first manuscript of the text to be published was preserved in that house. See in general, Wattenbach and others 1952–90: III, 348–49, and IV, 503, and Nelson 1991: 1–20.

<sup>160</sup> There is a lucid summary of authorship at Nelson 1991: 6–15.

<sup>161</sup> Meyer-Gebel 1987.

span between 882 and 887 is transmitted in very different versions in different manuscript traditions, one of which, running from 882 to 901, is known as the Bavarian continuation because of its heavily Bavarian content.<sup>162</sup> In the context of the present volume, it is worth contemplating what, if the hypothetical authorial attributions within the *Annales Fuldenses* could be proved in the way they have been for the *Annales Bertiniani*, such authorship would mean in late antique terms: it would be as if Hydatius had been Bishop of Ravenna and not of an impoverished and obscure see in Gallaecia. That said, the text of the *Annales Fuldenses* that has been transmitted to us behaves very much in the manner of the late antique chronicle and consularia traditions on which we have spent so much time, with sections whose origin is visible and identifiable alternating with other sections, the origins and significance of which are much harder for us to discern.

Overall, there are vast numbers of Carolingian chronicle texts ('Frankish annals'), the relationships among which are rarely clear cut. Different periods of modern scholarship have sometimes assigned different names to the same texts, while the conventional titles of many do not reflect what scholars now know of their actual origins and textual histories.<sup>163</sup> There is a traditional but largely arbitrary division between major and minor annals, a distinction which sometimes reflects the length of a text, sometimes the amount of unique historical information it contains.<sup>164</sup> The most important texts, like those discussed just above, have been extensively studied, but many obscurities remain. To take just a single example, the *Chronicon Laurissense breue* is a very short work that is extant in two very different recensions, in many different phases of compilation. Originally a Lorsch text, as the name suggests, a revised and expanded version was compiled from around 807 to 815 in Fulda, while still later recensions are associated with Reims

<sup>162</sup> Reuter 1992.

<sup>163</sup> To take just one example, the misleadingly named *Annales Laureshamnenses* (*Annals of Lorsch*), found in Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, MS 515, is in fact from an unlocalized south German source, written in a distinctive Alemannic script. The text is interesting historically because, unlike the *Annales regni Francorum*, it is peripheral to the centres of Carolingian power, including uncomfortable material on the history of Bavaria suppressed in the *Annales regni Francorum*. In other words, much as Hydatius or Marius of Avenches in the fifth and sixth centuries picked up what they could from the centre and supplemented it with whatever seemed important in their own, peripheral world, so too does an indisputably contemporary and local compilation like this so-called *Annals of Lorsch* demonstrate the difficulties of collecting information in the Carolingian era.

<sup>164</sup> McCormick 1975: 17–19 attempts to give some rigour to the distinction.

and the abbey at St Vaast.<sup>165</sup> The original Lorsch text actually begins in the year 685, drawing on Bede and Paul the Deacon, among other authors. Every other recension picks up in 714, with the death of Pippin II, therefore suggesting that while the original compilation wished to place eighth-century Frankish history in a larger, Mediterranean context, later compilers viewed the work as an essentially Frankish history.<sup>166</sup>

Perhaps more important, at least in terms of modern historiography, there remains the question of Frankish annals and Easter tables. We have already addressed the long-standing historiographical dogma that medieval 'annals' as a genre developed out of Easter tables, for which there is no evidence whatsoever. On the other hand, however, there are clearly Frankish chronicles that did begin as annotations to Easter tables, what we have called 'paschal chronicles'. In some cases, the apparatus of the table remains throughout the manuscript, in others only fossilized remnants of it do. Unfortunately, the whole question is unnecessarily complicated by the state of the editions from which scholars are obliged to work. The vast majority of Frankish chronicles have not been edited since the earliest volumes of the MGH *Scriptores* series appeared in the 1830s. Those publications, while perfectly adequate for what they do contain, actually print very little of the evidence necessary to understand them as texts, rather than as mere mines of dated factual information: almost always one gets the bare annalistic notices original to the particular chronicle with Arabic AD dates, but shorn of the chronographic framework and whatever derivative material surrounds it, whether from Bede, another medieval chronicle, or some earlier source. In fact, it is almost always impossible to discover the context in which the annalistic notices occur from the printed editions themselves, and in several cases even the introductory descriptions fail to reveal where precisely in a manuscript and in what manner the 'annals' were jotted. Bede's *De temporum ratione* provides an additional complication, since that computistic work attracted annotation almost magnetically. Annalistic notices in manuscripts of Bede are sometimes cited as if they were themselves paschal chronicles, although there are other chronicles that developed in the margins of Easter tables that circulated separately. What is more, because manuscripts circulated so rapidly in the Carolingian world, material from one type of chronicle could quickly appear in others of very different origin.

<sup>165</sup> Wattenbach and others 1952–90: II, 264–65 and Schnorr von Carolsfeld 1911 for the edition and textual history.

<sup>166</sup> McKitterick 2004: 35–36. On Lorsch, see Bischoff 1974.

To outline the textual vagaries of the numerous Frankish chronicles would be of little use to readers of the present book, but a bare listing of titles gives a sense of just how many such chronicles appeared between the later eighth and the earlier tenth centuries.<sup>167</sup> Among those that certainly had some computistic content or began as annotations to Easter tables, we may name the *Annales Iuuauenses*, *Annales Colonienses*, *Annales Corbeienses*, *Annales S. Amandi breues*, *Annales Laudunenses*, *Annales Prumienses*, *Annales Wirziburgenses*, *Annales Viridunenses*, *Annales Salisburgenses*, *Annales Marchianenses*, *Annales Floriacenses*, *Annales Laubienses*, *Annales Leodienses*, *Annales Auscienses*, *Annales S. Quintini Veromandensis*, *Annales Lemouicenses*, *Annales Niuernenses*, *Annales S. Columbae Senonensis*, *Annales S. Dionysii*, and *Annales S. Germani*.<sup>168</sup> Others, clearly, occurred as annotations to other works, whether Bede's *De temporum ratione*, calendars, necrologies, or even canon law collections: *Annales Mettenses priores*, *Annales S. Amandi*, *Annales Tiliani*, *Annales Laubacenses*, *Annales Mosellani*, *Annales Augienses*, *Annales Laure-shamenses minores*, *Chronicon Moissiacense*, *Annales Petauiani*, *Annales Guelferbytani*, *Annales Nazariani*, *Annales Alamannici*, *Annales Flauiniacenses*, *Annales Lausonenses*, *Annales S. Emmerammi*, *Annales Weingartenses*, *Annales Sangallenses*, *Annales Iburgenses*, *Annales Maximiniani*, *Annales Xantenses*, *Annales Vedastini*, *Annales Remenses*, *Annales Weissemburgenses*, *Annales Lugdunenses*, *Annales Masciacenses*, *Annales Blandinienses*, *Annales Aquenses*, *Annales Fossenses*, *Annales Fiscanenses*, *Annales Fontanellenses*, *Annales Sithienses*, *Annales Engolismenses*, and *Chronicon Nemausense*.<sup>169</sup>

<sup>167</sup> See the summaries in Wattenbach and others 1952–90: II, 183–92, 245–66; Ganshof 1970: 672–74; and Bautier 1970: 800–09.

<sup>168</sup> Editions as follows: *Annales Iuuauenses minores* and *maiores* (MGH SS, 1: 87–89, 30. 2: 727–44), *Annales Colonienses* (MGH SS, 1: 97–99, 17: 847–52), *Annales Corbeienses* (MGH SS, 3: 1–18), *Annales S. Amandi breues* (MGH SS, 2: 184), *Annales Laudunenses* (MGH SS, 15. 2: 1294–95), *Annales Prumienses* (MGH SS, 15. 2: 1289–94), *Annales Wirziburgenses* (MGH SS, 2: 238–47), *Annales Viridunenses* (MGH SS, 16: 500–02), *Annales Salisburgenses* (MGH SS, 1: 89–90), *Annales Marchianenses* (MGH SS, 16: 609–17), *Annales Floriacenses* (MGH SS, 2: 254–55, 13: 87–88, and Vidier 1965: 217–20), *Annales Laubienses* (MGH SS, 4: 8–28), *Annales Leodienses* (MGH SS, 4: 8–30), *Annales Auscienses* (MGH SS, 3: 171), *Annales S. Quintini Veromandensis* (MGH SS, 16: 507–08), *Annales Lemouicenses* (MGH SS, 2: 251–52), *Annales Niuernenses* (MGH SS, 13: 88–91), *Annales S. Columbae Senonensis* (MGH SS, 1: 102–09), and *Annales S. Germani* (MGH SS, 3: 166–68), which was continued to the end of the thirteenth century at the royal abbey of St Denis (*Annales S. Dionysii* and *Chronicon S. Dionysii*: MGH SS, 13: 718–21 and Berger 1879).

<sup>169</sup> *Annales Mettenses priores* (von Simson 1905), *Annales S. Amandi* (MGH SS, 1: 6–14), *Annales Tiliani* (MGH SS, 1: 6–8, 219–24), *Annales Laubacenses* (MGH SS, 1: 7–15, 52–55),

Many of these texts are related to one another, in ways that are still poorly understood, since many survive only in fragments covering the later eighth century and the first decade or two of the ninth. Some, like the *Annales Mettenses*, are clearly the work of contemporary and more or less continuous compilation; others are almost certainly retrospective compilations, at least in the fragments that survive. In both those respects 'Frankish annals' resemble Roman chronicles and consularia, as does the amount of overlap among related texts. Yet the Frankish chronicles bring additional complexities of their own, mostly a result of how texts have been transmitted to the present: unlike the late antique consularia still extant, which are spread out over many decades and centuries, our corpus of Carolingian chronicles is made up of texts that were almost all composed simultaneously. That is to say, the possibility of continuous cross-contamination of information in Carolingian texts is enormous and much harder to control for than it is in our scattered survivals from late antiquity, a problem exacerbated by the state of the editions, which as noted above leave whole sections of text drawn from late antique sources unpublished. In most respects, however, the Carolingian chronicles look exactly like the ancient chronicles with which the reader has now become familiar. The concern with subordinating information to a chronographic framework, the brevity of record, the lack of a fixed beginning and ending, and the paratactic style and the consequent difficulty of separating any hierarchy of importance among recorded information, all of these characteristics are familiar from examples of the genre going back to the ancient Near East.

*Annales Mosellani* (MGH SS, 16: 491–99), *Annales Augienses* (MGH SS, 1: 67–69), *Annales Laureshamenses minores* (MGH SS, 1: 22–39), *Chronicon Moissiacense* (MGH SS, 1: 280–313), *Annales Petauiani* (MGH SS, 1: 7–18), *Annales Guelferbytani* (MGH SS, 1: 23–44), *Annales Nazariani* (MGH SS, 1: 23–44), *Annales Alamannici* (MGH SS, 1: 22–56 and Lendi 1971), *Annales Flauiniacenses* (MGH SS, 3: 149–52), *Annales Lausonenses* (MGH SS, 3: 149–52, 24: 774–810), *Annales S. Emmerammi* (MGH SS, 1: 92–94), *Annales Weingartenses* (MGH SS, 1: 65–67), *Annales Sangallenses* (MGH SS, 1: 63–65, 72–85), *Annales Iburgenses* (MGH, 16: 434–38), *Annales Maximiniani* (MGH SS, 13: 19–25), *Annales Xantenses* (von Simson 1909: 1–39), *Annales Vedastini* (von Simson 1909: 40–82), *Annales Remenses* (MGH SS, 13: 81–84), *Annales Weissemburgenses* (MGH SS, 1: 111), *Annales Lugdunenses* (MGH SS, 1: 110), *Annales Masciacenses* (MGH SS, 3: 169–70), *Annales Blandinienses* (Grierson 1937), *Annales Aquenses* (MGH SS, 24: 33–41), *Annales Fossenses* (MGH SS, 4: 8–35), *Annales Fiscanenses* (MGH SS, 16: 482), *Annales Fontanellenses* (Laporte 1951 = *Chronicon Fontanellense*, MGH SS, 2: 301–04), *Annales Sithienses* (MGH SS, 13: 35–38), *Annales Engolismenses* (MGH SS, 16: 485–87), and *Chronicon Nemausense* (MGH SS, 3: 219). The fact that many of these texts are printed in parallel gives a sense of how difficult their overlapping textual histories are to untangle.

## Spanish Chronicle Traditions and the Frankish Model

As we noted above with respect to Carolingian literature more generally, the prestige of the Frankish model and the extent of Frankish conquests meant that Frankish literary genres were passed on to much of Europe in the course of the ninth century — for instance to northern Spain, where the chronicling tradition had fallen completely into abeyance after the Arab conquests. Whereas the historiographical tradition of the Spanish south was at first continuous with the Visigothic period, only later coming to be thoroughly Arabized, the far north of the peninsula remained almost completely untouched by the Muslim conquerors, who had little permanent impact beyond the Duero and the Upper Ebro river valleys, save for the small strip of Mediterranean coastline stretching northwards into the former *Narbonensis*, now for the first time regularly known as *Septimania*. While the south, under its new Islamic overlords, remained largely classical and Visigothic in its Latin culture — turning in ever decreasing circles, but not changing much under the pressure of the new political dispensation — in the north a new historiographical impetus arrived in the course of the late eighth century, undoubtedly under the influence of Francia.<sup>170</sup> There are confused notices in the seventh-century Fredegar chronicle of Frankish overlordship south of the Pyrenees, and it is very hard to know how seriously these notices should be taken.<sup>171</sup> Yet given how culturally Frankish the Asturian kingdom becomes in its attitudes and outlooks — and this despite the mythology, both contemporary and modern, of the Visigothic autochthony of the Asturians and their Reconquista — an early influx of Frankish influence is plausible if almost undocumentable in any meaningful way.<sup>172</sup>

Evidence for literary production in the central and northern parts of Spain is almost absent for the eighth century. The major sources swirl around the heresy of Adoptionism, which hypothesized that the second person of the trinity was really only a man who lived as other men but became divine at his baptism through the Holy Spirit. Though Elipandus of Toledo was one of the major exponents of the heresy (which had originated in the late second century), there is no real sign of the controversy affecting southern Spain; instead, it was a trans-Pyrenean phenomenon, drawing in northern and Pyrenean Spain, as well as Frankish luminaries like

<sup>170</sup> See the survey in Díaz y Díaz 1970.

<sup>171</sup> Larrañaga Elorza 1993.

<sup>172</sup> The best historiographical account of medieval Spain remains Linehan 1993.



Alcuin.<sup>173</sup> It was a council at Frankfurt that condemned Adoptionism as heretical in 794, and it is hard to imagine any clearer evidence of the interpenetration of the Frankish and Asturian cultural worlds in this period. It should, then, not surprise us that the revival of the chronicle genre in northern Spain should coincide with precisely this period of cultural and religious exchange.

The first early medieval chronicle from northern Spain was composed in the reign of Alfonso II of Asturias (r. 791–841). This so-called Alfonsine chronicle, which circulated under the royal name regardless of who actually composed it, has long been of interest to intellectual historians because it articulates a clear theory of *translatio imperii* from the Gothic monarchy of Toledo to the new Asturian rulers, a fiction also maintained through various eighth-century *laterculi* of the Gothic kings. More important are the differing tenth-century versions produced in the reign of Alfonso III (r. 866–c. 910). These chronicles have been much studied and in recent years much edited.<sup>174</sup> There are three basic texts, the *Chronica Albeldense*, the *Chronica Rotense*, and *Crónica de Sebastián*. The *Albeldense* is a court product, associated with the royal court at Oviedo and the monastery of Albelda in much the same way that the *Annales regni Francorum* and then the *Annales Bertiniani* are closely tied to the Carolingian court. The *Albeldense* is also interesting for setting its contemporary chronicle within the context of a universal history.<sup>175</sup> The *Rotense* is even more closely tied to the court, though the manuscript comes from San Millán de la Cogolla. Though its author knew and used the *Albeldense*, he was still more fixated on demonstrating the total continuity of the Asturian with the Visigothic monarchies, and it is here that the famous Pelayo of Spanish legend (a Gothic nobleman named Pelagius) is first linked with the dawn of a Christian *reconquista*.<sup>176</sup> A later recension of the *Rotense*, the so-

<sup>173</sup> For the works of Elipandus, see Cerro and Palacios 2002; for his opponent, Beatus of Liébana, see Löfstedt 1984.

<sup>174</sup> Bonnaz 1987 is the best edition.

<sup>175</sup> The manuscript includes Isidore's summary of the six ages of the world, an abridgement of Julius Honorius's geography, an epitome of imperial history derived from Isidore's *Chronica* and running from Romulus to Tiberius II, a *laterculus* of Gothic kings abridged from Isidore's *Historia Gothorum* with additions through to 711, and then an *Ordo Gothorum Obetensium regum* directly asserting a *translatio imperii* from Toledo to Oviedo and culminating in 881 with Alfonso the Great, followed by contemporary additions to 883.

<sup>176</sup> Both the *Albeldense* and the *Rotense* used the so-called *Crónica profética* (ed. by Gómez-Moreno 1932), an originally Toledan confection predicting the collapse of Muslim rule that found its largest audience in the north. This *Crónica profética* is a bizarre piece of work, a historical miscellany rather than a chronicle, which contains a prophecy showing that Muslim rule in Spain will end

called *Crónica de Sebastián*, is an 'improved', more pretentiously literary version of the text. In later years, the *Rotense* was continued by an anonymous continuator who probably worked under Ordoño II (r. 914–24) and whose work is inserted into the later *Historia Silense*. Later northern Spanish works continue in this Alfonsine, Carolingian-styled mode, and as the centre of gravity of the kingdom shifted away from Asturias-León and towards Castile, so did chronicles appear in that newly dynamic frontier region. In the tenth century we find for the first time the *Anales Castellanos Primeros*, which was perhaps put together around 939/40, and the much more widely diffused *Anales Castellanos Segundos*, of 989, which includes an epitome of the *Primeros* and which in some manuscripts is continued all the way down to the thirteenth century.

In the region that became Catalonia, historiographical traditions were even more directly influenced by Carolingian developments, in part because the marcher regions around Girona and Barcelona were in fact subject to Carolingian control for many decades beginning in the 790s.<sup>177</sup> The most prominent early Catalan text is not a chronicle, but an epitome history on the Carolingian model, the *Gesta comitum Barcinonensium*.<sup>178</sup> True chronicles appear in the region somewhat later. One or more *Chronica Riipullensia* began to be composed in the first half of the eleventh century at the monastery of Ripoll, the most important literary centre in the region, and these were widely diffused to other key sites like Roda by century's end. One such version, the *Chronicon Dertutense* is known at Tortosa by 1097, where it was continued down to 1210. In the twelfth century, chronicling

at the start of the 170th year of Muslim rule in Spain, which is to say, on the feast of St Martin of 883; Arab genealogies based on Arabic sources; a Mozarabic life of Muhammad from mid-ninth-century southern Spain; an interpretation of the fall of Spain as punishment for Gothic sins; a brief summary *De Goti qui remanserint ciuitates Ispaniensis* [sic]; and a *laterculus* of the Muslim governors of Al-Andalus that is accurate wherever it can be checked against external sources. This strange hotch-potch seems to have been put together in its existing form in the north of Spain precisely because it could be used to justify and predict the coming success of Alfonso III over the whole peninsula, but many of the materials it contains clearly stem from the Mozarabic south. Similar compilations of local interest are known from elsewhere in northern Spain: for instance, the large dossier of Navarrese material relating to Pamplona; see Lacarra 1945 and Díaz y Díaz 1970: 340–41.

<sup>177</sup> On the region, see generally Bonnassie 1975–76, and on its early historiography, see Coll i Alentorn 1951–52, with pp. 154–73 on chronicles. Carolingian-style chronicle: *Annales Barcinonenses* (MGH SS, 23: 1–2).

<sup>178</sup> Ed. Barrau Dihigo and Massó i Torrents 1925. The earliest redaction, which survives in a Paris manuscript of the twelfth century (Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, MS lat. 5132), begins with the reign of Wifred, the first count of Barcelona, and is continued in later redactions into the fourteenth century.

in Catalan lands becomes even more widespread at ecclesiastical centres like the monastery of Sant Cugat del Vallès.<sup>179</sup> The basic sources for the *Riuipullense* and its many descendants are Eusebius-Jerome, with supplements from Rufinus, Isidore, and Bede, as well as local documents of other genres, which are incorporated in order to fill the gap between the late antique evidence and the beginning of contemporary chronicling in the eleventh century. That the Catalan tradition follows so clearly on from Frankish models is shown in the general regional preference for *anni domini* over the Spanish era, in contrast to systems of reckoning in Castile and León. Only the *Dertutense* uses both the Frankish *anni domini* system and the Spanish era dates generally favoured further west in the peninsula.

### Late and Post-Carolingian Chronicles in Europe

The evidence from Spain gives one a sense of how far the chronicling mode diffused in the Carolingian period really spread. The *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, in all its many forms, should also be understood in this Carolingian context, given the Frankish models of Alfredian kingship. In parts of the former Lombard kingdom, minor chronicles on the Carolingian model also made their appearance after the Carolingian conquest.<sup>180</sup> Thereafter, the chronicle genre remains visible in parts of Italy, for instance at Benevento, even after Carolingian authority retreated, but it really only began to flourish in the peninsula in the twelfth century, whereupon we find a nearly continuous string of chronicles running into the late Middle Ages.<sup>181</sup>

The simple annalistic chronicles at which we have been looking are a copious product on the Carolingian model, but alongside them, the chronicle epitome invented by Isidore and Bede in the early Middle Ages also found favour in the Carolingian era. We mentioned briefly above the anonymous *Chronicon uniuersale* from the very late eighth century; it was probably compiled in Burgundy in 775–78

<sup>179</sup> Coll i Alentorn 1951–52: 162–64.

<sup>180</sup> E.g. the originally ninth-century *Chronicon Brixiense* (MGH SS, 3: 238–40 = MGH SRLang, 501–03). The *Chronica S. Benedicti Casinensis* (MGH SRLang, 467–88) is a *breviarium* not a chronicle.

<sup>181</sup> *Annales Barenses* (MGH SS, 5: 51–56), *Annales Casinates* (MGH SS, 3: 171–72), *Annales Beneuentani* (MGH SS, 3: 173–85), *Annales Cauenses* (MGH SS, 3: 185–97), and *Annales Lupi Protospatarii* (MGH SS, 5: 52–63). See Wattenbach and others 1952–90: IV, 432–33. Most Italian chronicles (to be consulted most easily in MGH SS, 18 and 19: 1–500) date from the twelfth century and later, but a few, for instance the *Annales Cremonenses* (MGH SS, 31: 1–21), begin in the eleventh century.

using many of the usual sources, Bede, Fredegar, and the *Liber historiae Francorum*, as well as a universal chronicle epitome running to 741, and was continued in annalistic form by one of the Frankish chronicles, the *Chronicon Moissiacense*, named above.<sup>182</sup> As the Carolingian age progressed, however, one begins to see the expansion of chronicle epitomes into more ambitiously comprehensive works, in rather the same manner that in the Greek East the large but chronologically driven chronicles of Syncellus and Theophanes gave way to the massive universal *breviaria* of George the Monk and his successors. Much the most significant Carolingian example of this trend is the work of Frechulf, bishop of Lisieux, who probably finished writing his *Historiae* around the year 829. In two very large books, Frechulf takes his reader from Creation to the birth of Christ and then from Augustus to the death of Gregory the Great, drawing on a wide variety of sources, not least the chronicle of Jerome and the epitomes of Isidore and Bede.<sup>183</sup> Theologically, Frechulf had a greater understanding of and commitment to Augustine's idea of the six ages of Creation than did any other medieval author.<sup>184</sup> In explicating it, however, he took a great deal of information from chronicle sources and rearranged it into a universal history that did without chronological lemmata altogether.

In contrast with Frechulf, Ado of Vienne wrote a universal chronicle epitome from Adam, basing himself largely on Bede, but also on many of the standard late antique authors on history and an otherwise unknown chronicle source from Vienne, which he brings down to his own date in 870.<sup>185</sup> At the very beginning of the tenth century, the last Carolingian writer of any note, Regino of Prüm, wrote another universal history which demonstrates how alive the late antique chronicle tradition remained at that time.<sup>186</sup> The chronicle covers the period from the

<sup>182</sup> MGH SS, 13: 1–19 = Mommsen 1898: 336–40 (*Chronicon uniuersale ad 741*) and MGH SS, 1: 280–313 (*Chron. Moissiacense*). See Wattenbach and others 1952–90: II, 260. The *Chronicon Vedastinum* (MGH SS, 13: 674–709), compiled at the end of the eleventh century, is a similar work in the same tradition: see Wattenbach and others 1952–90: V, 536–37.

<sup>183</sup> Allen 2002 replaces the old edition of PL, 106: 917–1258. For the older literature, see Wattenbach and others 1952–90: III, 350–51.

<sup>184</sup> Staubach 1995.

<sup>185</sup> PL, 123: 23–138 but a new edition on the model of Allen's Frechulf is desirable. See also Wattenbach and others 1952–90: V, 623. The *Chronicon Viennense* is edited separately in MGH SS, 24: 816–18.

<sup>186</sup> The old edition, MGH SS, 1: 537–612, with the continuations to 967 at pp. 613–29, is replaced by Kurze 1890. There is an accurate translation in MacLean 2009. For the older literature, see Wattenbach and others 1952–90: VI, 900–05.

Incarnation to 906 and was sent by its author to Bishop Adalbero of Augsburg in 908. It represents the efforts of Regino's retirement to Trier in 899, after he had been removed from his abbacy at Prüm in the struggles over the rulership of Lotharingia. Regino's research was extensive and his chronography diligent. While *anni domini* provide the universal chronology, Roman imperial dates are correlated with these until 741, with Frankish regnal dates deployed thereafter. His main source was Bede's second epitome, supplementing it from Paul the Deacon's *Historia Langobardorum* and the *Liber pontificalis*, before using the *Annales regni Francorum* for the eighth and earlier ninth centuries, and then moving forward to more original research for the later ninth century. The great innovation of Regino, and one that marks an important transition to the universal chronicles of the high Middle Ages, was his decision to begin from AD 1, that is to say, the first year of Christ's incarnation, rather than an earlier date, like the Abraham of Eusebius-Jerome or the then standard creation of the world. While that decision was carried on by his many successors, they did not adopt his strange habit of grouping events that were precisely dated in his sources under multi-year lemmata. Despite the oddity of his chronographic apparatus, the work of Regino remained hugely important as a historiographical model: it showed how a universal chronicle could represent an author's present time as the culmination of a history that was Christian not merely because it had been shaped by God's six ages of Creation, but rather because historical time itself was represented as starting with the very incarnation of God's son.

### *The Central Middle Ages in the West*

The Carolingian period really did produce a literary renaissance in western Europe, introducing new genres and reviving or reinventing old ones which went on to have a continuous presence throughout the rest of the Middle Ages and into the early modern world. Historiography between the later ninth and the early thirteenth centuries has been well studied by medievalists, not least because the nation-states of modern Europe make their first indisputable appearance in those centuries; a corpus of 'national' texts was the framework within which most nineteenth-century editors and interpreters worked, and the central Middle Ages provided rich materials for interpretation but not the overwhelming sea of documentation that the late Middle Ages and Renaissance bring with them.<sup>187</sup> For

<sup>187</sup> We have found that Southern 1970, 1971, 1972, and 1973 remain a particularly helpful orientation to the idea and praxis of history in the Middle Ages.

the purposes of the present volume, the explosion of evidence from the late Carolingian period onwards makes any attempt at a survey, even a selective one, quite impossible; the many regional studies of high medieval historiography can provide some guidance here.<sup>188</sup> The various genres that we touched on briefly in surveying the Carolingian world — biography, narrative history, hagiography, epitome history, and many others — all continued to flourish and indeed grow too numerous for us to mention. In what follows, our only concern is to show that chronicling on the ancient model — chronographic, annalistic, brief, and paratactic in style — continues into the high Middle Ages and that late ancient and early medieval chronicles and chronicle epitomes continued to be used by authors of the central Middle Ages as a source with which to understand the past in the familiar compressed mode of the chronicle. We take the work of Sigebert of Gembloux as our cut-off point: written at the start of the twelfth century, Sigebert's chronicle is both a true chronicle in its use of chronographic apparatus and the medieval apex of that tradition. The work was immensely popular and formed the basis of the chronologies of many writers of the later Middle Ages, while itself being a work of genuine research, digging into the works of antiquity. When Sigebert wrote, the full panoply of medieval historical genres was available and flourishing, and his own massive work is a sort of throwback to an earlier time, since it does very much, like the chronicles of antiquity and late antiquity, present history almost down to the time of writing *uno in conspectu*. It might indeed be thought of as the culmination of the Carolingian revival of the chronicle genre. Before arriving at Sigebert, however, we can touch briefly on the continuation of chronicling traditions across Europe in the post-Carolingian centuries.

### Post-Carolingian Europe and its Peripheries

The many works of Bede had a decisive influence on the development of Continental writing, from theology through chronography to history proper. In England, however, Bede cast a very long shadow, so that works on a similar scale to his *Historia* were not attempted again until the beginning of the twelfth century, well after the first impact of the Norman Conquest had been absorbed and a new Anglo-Norman culture had started to come into being. Eadmer, Geoffrey of Monmouth, and William of Malmesbury, all writing in the twelfth century, mark the beginning of the rich vein of narrative history that characterizes medieval English

<sup>188</sup> E.g., for France, see Labande 1970 and Bautier 1970; for Germany, see Buchner 1970.

writing throughout the high and later Middle Ages. As we have already seen, the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* is the English work that most clearly resembles the ancient chronicling tradition, and it was continued well down into the Norman period. That said, Latin had at that point supplanted Old English as the main language of chronicles, a great many of which continued to be compiled throughout the Middle Ages. Chronicles, often those of monastic foundations, were produced in considerable quantity, sometimes without directly continuing earlier works. The *Annals of Burton-on-Trent*, for instance, follows precisely the chronographic and paratactic style we have observed throughout this study, but it continues no other chronicle, instead beginning with the foundation of the monastery at Burton in 1004.<sup>189</sup> A very large number of other such chronicles survive from the later eleventh century onwards, and they clearly represent the same generic form as the chronicles at which we have been looking elsewhere.<sup>190</sup>

In the former Carolingian Empire, chronicles flourished uninterruptedly, both in its old central heartland and in areas that had always been peripheral to it. While some of the great ninth-century annals ceased to be compiled by the end of that century, the majority of the 'Frankish annals' that we listed above continued to be compiled into the tenth century and sometimes much later, into the twelfth, thirteenth, or even beyond. Just as important, many new compilations begun in the tenth and eleventh centuries used as their starting point either an epitome of an older Carolingian chronicle or one of the main early medieval chronicle epitomes. The old western Frankish heartland between the Loire and the Rhine saw many such works. To take one such example, the *Annales Floriacenses* is found in a manuscript containing Bede's computistical works but was annotated using older local evidence to produce a full-blown chronicle in the eleventh century, with an abbreviated version appearing later.<sup>191</sup> In the thirteenth century, this same chronicle was then written up into a universal chronicle from Creation to the time of

<sup>189</sup> Ed. Henry Richards Luard, Rolls Series, 36. 1: 183–500.

<sup>190</sup> The most substantial of these texts are edited in the five volumes of the *Annales Monastici*, Rolls Series, 36. 1–5: the *Margan Annals*, the *Annals of Tewkesbury*, and the *Annals of Burton* (vol. I), *Annals of Winchester* and *Annals of Waverley* (vol. II), *Annals of Dunstable* and *Annals of Bermondsey* (vol. III), *Annals of Osney* and *Annals of Worcester* (vol. IV). The fifth volume is an index.

<sup>191</sup> Manuscripts: Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, MS lat. 5543 and Bern, Burgerbibliothek, MS 306 (short version). Editions: Vidier 1965: 217–20 and MGH SS, 2: 254–55 = PL, 139: 582–84, which is incomplete, and MGH SS, 13: 87–88 (short version). Compiled at the monastery of Saint-Benoit-sur-Loire, these annals of Fleury ran from 997 to 1060, with evidence of more or less continuous contemporary compilation through to 1029.

writing.<sup>192</sup> The Anjou region, growing in importance throughout the tenth century, produced a number of chronicles, some of them with roots in Carolingian chronicle texts. The abbey of Saint-Aubin produced a local chronicle drawing on earlier local texts like a Vendômois chronicle of the very early twelfth century and a late eleventh-century work from Angers traditionally attributed to Raynaud, archdeacon of Saint-Maurice d'Angers.<sup>193</sup> In more peripheral regions of western Gaul, there is less evidence for historical composition, though at Nantes the *Chronicon Namnetense* probably drew on a late Carolingian chronicle source to create what nevertheless ended up being an epitome history, not a chronicle.<sup>194</sup> In Aquitaine, which produced few chronicles in the Carolingian period, the tenth and eleventh centuries witnessed an explosion of historical writing, of which the monk Ademar of Chabannes is an exemplary representative. In the early eleventh century, he produced a large body of work, for instance a *Commemoratio abbatum Lemouicensium basilice S. Martialis Apostoli*, which attempts to create chronological synchronisms between the abbots and bishops of Limoges, the kings of France, and a number of secular princes, all running to the year 1025, not long before Ademar's own death.<sup>195</sup> While this set of synchronisms does not constitute a chronicle, Ademar also wrote a *Chronicon*, a chronicle epitome in three books tracing Frankish history from Trojan origins to the ninth century and relying wholesale on Fredegar and the *Annales regni Francorum*, before continuing in its own right to 1029.<sup>196</sup> Ademar's work was, in turn, continued in a local Limousin hand down to the fifteenth century.<sup>197</sup> The abbey of St Victor at Marseille likewise

<sup>192</sup> Laporte 1954.

<sup>193</sup> Halphen 1903 edits the *Annales S. Albani Andecauensis*, the *Annales Vindocinenses*, and the *Annales Rainaldi Archidiaconi*, along with the closely related *Annales S. Sergii Andecauensis*, which copies the *Annales Rainaldi* into continuous form and then moves forward to an episodic epitome of local history loosely structured by comital reign. The *Annales Vindocinenses* and the *Annales Rainaldi Archidiaconi* both drew on a common earlier source, probably an annalistic work composed at Saint-Maurice in the tenth century, which explains their close connection through to the year 1075 after which resemblances largely cease, though both these and other related texts were continued for many decades after 1075 at Angers. Halphen 1903: xlvii gives a stemma. As is usually the case, none of the titles of the works discussed here has any manuscript authority.

<sup>194</sup> Merlet 1896. The text runs to 1049.

<sup>195</sup> Ed. Duplès-Agier 1874: 1–27.

<sup>196</sup> Ed. Waitz 1883, MGH SS, 4: 106–48, and Chavanon 1897.

<sup>197</sup> Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, MS lat. 11019 has all the continuations; Vaticanus Reg. 984 does not, though it is older, belonging to the twelfth century. Saint-Martial of Limoges continued



produced a long chronicle that ultimately ran down to the sixteenth century, based in its early parts on earlier Frankish texts and going through various phases of contemporary compilation in the high Middle Ages.<sup>198</sup> Such examples show quite clearly how a continuous tradition of Carolingian-style chronicling, often linking early medieval chronicle epitomes to contemporary, or recently retrospective, compilations survived throughout central and southern France even as the Carolingian Empire broke up and its northern French successors failed to impose themselves in Aquitaine and the south. In the disputed kingdoms of Lotharingia and the north-eastern parts of Francia, much the same sort of historiographical continuity can be observed even as the political unity of the region devolved ever further into the feudal patchwork of the high Middle Ages.<sup>199</sup> One gets a sense of just how dynamic and ever changing the transmission of these chronicles was by considering that, by the end of the tenth century, late Carolingian chronicles from Cologne were taken up at the abbey of St-Bénigne in Dijon and sporadically updated through the thirteenth century.<sup>200</sup> But this *Annales S. Benigni* was itself picked up and continued in Normandy at the abbey of Fécamp (which for a time shared a pluralist abbot with Saint-Bénigne), where the *Annales Rotomagenses* had been compiled for the first time around 1084, before being continued all the way

to be an important centre of history writing, with the works of Bernard Itier at the beginning of the thirteenth century incorporating much that had gone before and also supplying us with a list of the works then available at the abbey: Duplès-Agier 1874: x–xlviii.

<sup>198</sup> *Annales S. Victoris Massiliensis*: MGH SS, 23: 1–7 and Albanès 1886.

<sup>199</sup> Thus the *Annales Blandinienses*, by way of illustration, was first compiled at St Pierre de Gand (Gent) in the eleventh century, probably using earlier compilations going back to the Carolingian era and supplying much of the earliest known evidence for the rise of the county of Flanders. It is edited in Grierson 1937 along with the *Annales Elmarenses*, the *Annales Formoselenses*, and the *Annales Elnonenses*. It is worth noticing here as one of the very few full-length chronicles that are clearly organized around an Easter cycle, with three cycles from 1 to 532, 533 to 1064, and 1065 to 1405. The entries through to 1060 are written in a single hand, presumably that of the original compiler, and from the mid-eleventh century additional blocks of text were added at irregular intervals until compilation stops in the 1290s. The record of the first two Easter cycles is contained in heavily abbreviated epitomes, merely noting the names of Roman emperors in their accession year and the number of years they reigned. From 548, most years contain annotation. Throughout, all the apparatus of a functioning Easter table has disappeared, leaving only the notional structure of three Easter cycles and the enumeration of each passing year. Whether the source on which the eleventh-century compiler of the *Annales Blandinienses* relied was itself a more elaborate Easter table is impossible to tell, though it is clear from the close connection of the text with the related *Annales Formoselenses* and *Annales Elmarenses* that all derived from an earlier chronicle, now lost.

<sup>200</sup> *Annales S. Benigni Diuionensis*: MGH SS, 5: 37–50.

down to the fourteenth century, in the meantime forming a major source for other Norman chronicles like the *Annales Vticensis* at Saint-Evroutlt and the *Annales Gemmeticensis* of Jumièges.<sup>201</sup> We could suggest many similar examples, most of them pertaining to cathedral schools and monastic houses, a great many of which compiled chronicles that were based to a greater or lesser extent on earlier Carolingian sources and which were then continued at least into the twelfth century if not beyond.

All of these chronicles have much the same sort of common concerns as did late antique chronicles, focusing on major meteorological and astronomical events, natural disasters and man-made tragedies like large fires, and of course the succession of local churchmen, princes, and where practicable, royal figures as well. But as in the immediately post-imperial period, the breakdown of the centralized power of the Carolingian state meant that the local became central to these medieval chronicles, and anything that could be discovered at all was thrown into the mix in order to tell the local story. Unsurprisingly, the ease with which such chronicles could be compiled meant that they spread far and wide, not least into the duchies and kingdoms that developed out of the eastern parts of the Frankish kingdom and the regions beyond it.<sup>202</sup> Thus the chronicle form could be used to place new Scandinavian or Slavic powers on the map of Frankish, and thus universal, history. From Bohemia to Denmark to Sweden chronicles gave local and contemporary events a deep past, sometimes on a very ambitious scale, like the *Annales Lundenses* which runs from the Incarnation.<sup>203</sup> The *Chronica Boemorum* of Cosmas of Prague

<sup>201</sup> The *Annales Rotomagensis*, *Annales Vticensis*, *Annales Gemmeticensis*, and *Annales S. Stephani Cadomensis* are edited in MGH SS, 26: 488–517; for the *Annales Gemmeticensis*, see also Laporte 1954.

<sup>202</sup> Chronicles whose texts begin before 1100 from Lotharingia and Germany include the *Annales Ottenburani* (MGH SS, 5: 1–9), *Annales Scafhusenses* (MGH SS, 5: 388), *Annales Gengebacenses* (MGH SS, 5: 389–90), *Annales Magdeburgenses* (MGH SS, 16: 105–96 and 30. 2: 748–49), *Annales Babenburgenses* (MGH SS, 17: 634–42), *Annales Bremenses* (MGH SS, 17: 854–58), *Annales S. Aegidii Brunswicensis* (MGH SS, 30. 1: 6–19), *Annales Moguntini* (MGH SS, 17: 1–3), *Annales Wormatienses* (MGH SS, 17: 74–79), *Annales Spirenses* (MGH SS, 17: 80–85), *Annales Argentinenses* (MGH SS, 17: 86–90), *Annales Marbacenses* (Bloch 1907), and *Annales Maurimonasteriensis* (MGH SS, 17: 181–82), along with many others that only began to be compiled after 1100. Most of the Austrian chronicles (collectively *Annales Austriae*, MGH SS, 9: 479–843 and 30. 1: 3–4) are quite late, but many pick up from an earlier Frankish predecessor.

<sup>203</sup> See, e.g., the *Annales Bohemiae breuissimi* (MGH SS, 17: 719–21), which picks up *medias in res* in 80 and continues to 1453, or the *Annales Lundenses* (MGH SS, 29: 185–209). The Scandinavian chronicles as a group are edited in MGH SS, 29: 174–237, many taking up where a Frankish chronicle leaves off.

began with an epitomized biblical history from the time of the Flood, but from the baptism of the Bohemian prince Borivoi in 894 Cosmas kept up a rigorously annalistic format, recording *anni domini* lemmata even in the long stretches of the tenth century in which he had no events to record.<sup>204</sup> Rather than multiply further descriptions of these essentially local chronicles, however interesting they may be in their own right, we can conclude our discussion with the development of the universal chronicle out of the Carolingian era, whether in the form of an epitome or as a more extensive text.

We have already considered Regino of Prüm as the last of the universal writers of the Carolingian period, though he really did work at the very tail end of Carolingian hegemony in East Francia. What distinguishes universal chronicles like Regino's from their late antique and even their earlier medieval predecessors is their scale. This was very large by the standards of a chronicle epitome like Isidore's or Bede's. But despite their scale, they are also not direct analogues of the post-Theophanes Byzantine world chronicles, for the Latin works tend to observe the same primacy of chronographic framework as would a traditional chronicle, whereas the chronological precision of Theophanes was abandoned by those successors who copied merely the sheer amplitude of his writing. That is to say, like a Latin chronicle epitome, they may epitomize the contents so that chronological lemmata are suppressed where there is no information to record under them, but wherever events are recorded, chronological markers are preserved and maintain a consistent system.

Regino was by no means the only author of a universal chronicle on that model. In the middle of the eleventh century, Hermann of Reichenau (Herimannus Augiensis) wrote a chronicle to the year 1054, drawing heavily on Bede, but producing the first major text that allowed the events of the eleventh century to be grasped in a small compass.<sup>205</sup> Lampert of Hersfeld, writing around 1080, used the annalistic format of a chronicle to narrate the beginnings of the Investiture Controversy.<sup>206</sup> Not long afterwards, Frutolf of Michelsberg and his continuator Ekkehard of Aura created a work founded upon the early medieval reworked version of the chronicle of Eusebius-Jerome that culminated with the reign of the German emperor Henry V, but which was structured as a universal chronicle with a framework of regnal years and *anni domini* and sometimes even some *ab urbe condita* dates.

<sup>204</sup> MGH SS, 9: 1–209.

<sup>205</sup> MGH SS, 5: 67–133, with Buchner 1960.

<sup>206</sup> Holder-Egger 1894.

Within this chronicle were embedded long sections of miscellaneous non-annalistic historical material from Jordanes, Orosius, Bede, the *Historia Miscella*, Paul the Deacon, Einhard, Liutprand, chronicles like the *Chronicon Wirziburgense*, and many others, particularly in the period between the end of Jerome and the accounts of more contemporary history at the beginning of the eleventh century.<sup>207</sup> In this way it is much like the *Chronicon Paschale*, which used non-chronicle sources within a chronicle framework when nothing else was available. Marianus Scottus composed a world chronicle running from the Incarnation to 1104, using *anni domini* as lemmata.<sup>208</sup> This was brought to England by Robert of Hereford at the end of the eleventh century and became the foundation for a new universal chronicle put together in the 1120s at the instance of Wulfstan of Worcester, seriously trying to locate English events in a universal context.<sup>209</sup> In France, Hugh of Fleury wrote the first edition of his history in four books in 1109 and then, having discovered a new source for the Byzantine East, a second edition in six books in 1110, running from Augustus to the year of writing. Though resembling a chronicle epitome in its content, the relative sparseness of its chronological apparatus places it closer to an epitome history like that of the 'Fredegar' author.<sup>210</sup>

As that example of course shows, in many cases the line between chronicle and other genres is hard to draw precisely: as in late antiquity, genre is never entirely clear cut and works fall somewhere along a fairly broad continuum. Thus while the universal chronicle epitomes retain their essential chronographic framework whilst eliminating most of the chronological lemmata in the interests of brevity, a work like the *Chronicon Montis Sereni*, associated with the ducal house of Wettin, is wholly annalistic but on such a scale that it concludes looking like an annalistic narrative history, rather than a chronicle: it covers the period 1124–1225 in eighty-eight

<sup>207</sup> MGH SS, 6: 33–267, the *Chronicon uniuersale*. The *Chronicon Wirziburgense* (MGH SS, 6: 17–32), attributed to Ekkehard, is a much more compressed epitome of Eusebius-Jerome likewise structured entirely by regnal years, extended back to Creation and forward to 1057.

<sup>208</sup> MGH SS, 5: 481–568; continuations in MGH SS, 13: 72–79.

<sup>209</sup> Southern 1973: 250–51. The authorship, once ascribed to Florence of Worcester, now more frequently to John of Worcester, is disputed: Darlington and McGurk 1995–98.

<sup>210</sup> Hugh of Fleury: MGH SS, 9: 337–64 = PL, 163: 821–54, with Wilmart 1938 and Vidier 1965: 76–79. As was normal with these high medieval authors, Hugh did not confine himself to this epitomizing work, but rather also wrote a more contemporary history, a *Historia moderna*, less broadly circulated than his chronicle epitome, which was dedicated to Matilda, niece of Adela of Blois: MGH SS, 9: 376–95 = PL, 163: 873–912.

Scriptores pages, yet devotes forty of those, almost half, to the final decade.<sup>211</sup> That such questions concerning genre are so common reflects the diversification of historical genres as the Middle Ages progress. So it is that, in parallel with universal chronicle epitomes, proper universal history also developed, most famously Otto of Freising's *Chronica* or *Historia de duabus ciuitatibus* (*The Two Cities*). This grand, theoretical history of the world made an enormous contribution to the future historiographical development of the Middle Ages, but it abandons not just the paratactic style of the chronicle genre — so do many of the more loquacious true medieval chronicles — but also the whole idea of a chronographic framework.<sup>212</sup>

In observing the proliferation of historical genres beyond chronicle, we should also remember that chronicles could be used as sources by authors working in other genres altogether. In the Carolingian period, for instance, as we have had occasion to note elsewhere, Andreas Agnellus's *Liber pontificalis* of the Ravenna bishops used an ancient consularia source and remains a valuable witness to that tradition, even though the work itself is a fundamentally early medieval work of serial biography.<sup>213</sup> Gervase of Tilbury's *Otia imperialia*, a strange thirteenth-century miscellany of outlandish stories, geography, history, and other genres, drew on the Carolingian *Chronicon Moissiacense*, which in turn continued the Frankish chronicle epitome of 741, itself based on Bede and Isidore.<sup>214</sup>

It is hard to detect many other examples of the medieval use of consularia, but late antique and early medieval chronicles remained a major source of historical information for the high Middle Ages and its historians. Just as Bede had used Eusebius-Jerome, Prosper, Marcellinus, and Isidore in 725, the Carolingian Frechulf had in 827 used Jerome, Prosper, Marius, Isidore, and Bede, and Regino of Prüm relied heavily on Bede in 908, so in 1054 did Hermann of Reichenau use Jerome, Prosper, Cassiodorus, Marcellinus, Isidore, and Bede, while in 1082, Marianus Scottus used Jerome, Prosper, Cassiodorus, Isidore, and Bede. In 1102 Hugh of Flavigny used Jerome, Prosper, Hydatius, Victor, and Bede, and in 1111 Sigebert, with whom we shall soon conclude, used Jerome, the *Gallic Chronicle of 452*, Hydatius, Cassiodorus, Isidore, and Bede, and was himself used by contemporaries

<sup>211</sup> MGH SS, 23: 138–226.

<sup>212</sup> Hofmeister 1912.

<sup>213</sup> See now Deliyannis 2004 and Deliyannis 2006, with summary of older literature in Wattenbach and others 1952–90: IV, 428–31.

<sup>214</sup> See note 182 above for the *Chronicon uniuersale ad 741*. See also Wattenbach and others 1952–90: II, 265–66 and Banks and Binns 2002, with a full *index fontium* at pp. 937–54.

like Ekkehard of Aura, who also used these same late antique sources.<sup>215</sup> We can also look at it the other way around: the chronicle of Hydatius, for instance, completed in c. 468, was used by later compilers and chroniclers in 511, 613, 626, 1039, 1111, and 1182.

The late antique chronicle tradition, in other words, continued to exercise a direct and immediate influence on and inspiration for later chroniclers right into the twelfth century. No less important, late antique chronicles were not just being used as sources by medieval chroniclers, they were also being read and recopied in their own right. A large number of the multiple surviving manuscripts of Jerome, Prosper, Isidore, and Bede come from between the eighth and the twelfth centuries; all six manuscripts of the *Gallic Chronicle of 452* were copied between the ninth and twelfth centuries; Marcellinus *comes* survives in a sixth-century manuscript and three others of the eleventh and twelfth; and Cassiodorus in two of the tenth and eleventh. Our sole manuscripts of Hydatius and Marius of Avenches date from the ninth and the ninth or tenth century respectively. Even consularia were being read and copied in this period: the *Paschale Campanum* manuscript is seventh century, the *Excerpta Sangallensia* were copied in the 830s, the *Descriptio consulum* is found in a ninth-century manuscript (with Hydatius) and three related twelfth-century manuscripts, the single half-leaf of the *Consularia Marsiburgensia* from Merseburg is eleventh-century, and the copy of Eusebius-Jerome-Prosper that contains the Hafniensis continuation of Prosper is twelfth century. All were simultaneously being used as sources in surviving medieval chronicles. These are important reminders that the chronicle tradition, transmitted from deep ancient roots to the early Middle Ages, continued to serve a number of complementary purposes even as new genres, suited to other functions, also began to come into their own. History had become longer, historical time deeper, and the various newly rediscovered genres of narrative history were on a scale that one could enjoy, but only at considerable leisure. Chronicles continued to offer what they had always offered: an alternative way of envisaging past time, of grasping it quickly and efficiently, *uno in conspectu*. That made a difference in a time of proliferating literature about the past. Sigebert of Gembloux, the last major writer to produce a medieval work comparable with those in the ancient chronicling tradition that has concerned us at such length thus makes an ideal stopping point for our survey.

<sup>215</sup> Schmale-Ott 1971.

## Sigebert of Gembloux

At the very end of our discussion stands the chronicle of Sigebert of Gembloux, a man who, as we have said, created a major source for the historical writers of the high and later Middle Ages and in so doing also put a close to the early medieval developments of the chronicle tradition from its late antique roots.<sup>216</sup> Born somewhere in Lotharingia, Sigebert lived c. 1030–1112 and was raised at the Benedictine abbey of Gembloux near Liège. He ended his life there too, as a monk, having in the interim taught in the school of the abbey at Metz.<sup>217</sup> In politics, he had very strong views on the pretensions of the reforming papacy and wrote polemical works that clearly favoured the cause of the German emperor Henry IV against Gregory VII and his papal successors.<sup>218</sup> Something of a literary polymath, Sigebert wrote many works in all the normal post-Carolingian genres.<sup>219</sup> Among the most important on a historical topic was the *Gesta abbatum Gemblacensium* down to 1048, later continued by his follower Godescalc, which fits neatly into the genre of episcopal and abbatial *gesta* that the diffusion of the *Liber pontificalis* under Charlemagne had inspired.<sup>220</sup> He wrote a *uita* of the sainted Frankish king Sigebert III and various works of hagiography, not to mention a work *De uiris illustribus* modelled on that of Jerome and his continuators.<sup>221</sup> But it is his chronicle to which the greatest importance has always been attached.<sup>222</sup>

The chronicle begins with a brief miscellaneous historical introduction and summary, drawing from 'Fredegar', Prosper, Bede, Jordanes, Paul the Deacon, and Marianus Scottus.<sup>223</sup> This is then resolved into a series of *fila regnorum* on the model of Eusebius-Jerome, but with a thoroughly 'modernized' set of *regna*: Romans, Persians, Franks, Vandals, English, Lombards, Visigoths, Ostrogoths, and Huns. The full chronological apparatus begins in 381 (no doubt intended to be the

<sup>216</sup> The notion of Sigebert as turning point is widespread: Bautier 1970: 837.

<sup>217</sup> For Sigebert's biography, see Chazan 1999: 33–40, 58–61, 101–04.

<sup>218</sup> See Robinson 2004: 276–78, 281–83.

<sup>219</sup> He gives a list of his own works in the final chapter (172) of his *De uiris illustribus*.

<sup>220</sup> MGH SS, 8: 523–42.

<sup>221</sup> *Vita S. Sigeberti regis*: PL, 87: 304–14; *De uiris illustribus*: Witte 1974. Almost all Sigebert's works, barring his most extreme anti-papal writings, are collected in PL, 160. For the *De uiris*, see also note 10 above.

<sup>222</sup> MGH SS, 6: 300–74, with its many continuations at 6: 375–474.

<sup>223</sup> Overall, the editor of the standard edition could identify fully eighty-three different sources (Chazan 1999: 121).

year following the conclusion of Eusebius-Jerome in 378), with the unnumbered (and incorrect) consulship of Gratian and Valentinian and a series of invented regnal years for partly invented rulers of the various *regna*. Thereafter, these regnal years, both invented and actual, are synchronized to basic *anni domini* drawn from Bede, which structure the passage of time for Sigebert.<sup>224</sup> In the first version of the chronicle, which probably took more than twenty years to compose, the long march of history led to the year 1084 and the imperial coronation of Henry IV; the second version, on which Sigebert continued to work until his death in 1112, was eventually completed and published by his abbot, Anselm of Gembloux.<sup>225</sup>

Everything in Sigebert's work is subordinated to his chronographic framework of *annus domini* and regnal year; years are never omitted, even when this fullness of content requires him to include a whole string of authors and their floruits in a given year rather than record any actual event. He stayed with this dependable chronographic framework whether he was drawing on and rewriting a bare reference from Bede or a complicated account from the *Historia* of Widukind of Corvey: he drew from every genre available in his period and rewrote whatever he found to suit his model. By the seventh century, Sigebert's entries generally become longer and they flit more easily across large stretches of space and time. *Fila regnorum* come and go, gradually shrinking to just the Romans, Franks, and English, before expanding again to take in the new kingdom of Jerusalem. As is so often the case with long universal chronicles, the entries sometimes become very long indeed as the author's own date of writing approaches, and one can certainly see this in Sigebert, particularly on topics on which he has a special interest, like the death of the emperor Henry IV in 1106.

Taken as a whole, Sigebert's achievement was to have created a massive picture of all the kingdoms that existed in the world of his own day, a picture that could be grasped *uno in conspectu*. The whole of the known world could be apprehended synchronically at a glance and, with a little work, diachronically as well. The result was a rebuilding of the Eusebius-Jerome model for a new age of European kingdoms and their half-understood neighbours. With the strange combination of universal outlook, scholarly research, and chronographic framework, Sigebert in

<sup>224</sup> For the chronology, see Chazan 1999: 162–78. Years from Adam make a single appearance at the start of the chronicle; thereafter, everything is drawn from Bede. In the earliest manuscripts, the *anni domini* appear every ten years to structure the year-by-year regnal calculations — copied, no doubt, from the decennial years from the birth of Abraham in Eusebius-Jerome — but in later manuscripts, they are noted every year.

<sup>225</sup> For the date and duration of composition, see Chazan 1999: 105–10, with references to the literature.



a sense re-enacted the Eusebian project of late antiquity, although he also continued it by choosing the end of Jerome's chronicle as the point from which he would begin the annual record of his own work. Eusebius had been forced to create a chronology from the ground up in order to portray a useable historical past; Sigebert stood at a great enough remove from the late antique chronicle tradition to begin anew and undertake the same sort of research that had once produced Eusebius's chronicle. In doing so, he clearly rejected Regino of Prüm's eccentric reordering of world history, but equally refused to endorse what was already becoming the dominant approach to history, which meant simply taking a Bedan framework for the past and lopping it off at the incarnation of Christ to provide a historical starting point. Instead, like Eusebius long before, Sigebert created a framework of regnal years within *fila regnorum* that had historical meaning within the chronicle and meaning independent of the way in which the chronologies corresponded to historical 'fact'. And again like Eusebius before him, Sigebert created a wave of enthusiasm for the genre which he did so much to revolutionize: Sigebert of Gembloux, though he was a Lotharingian and a devoted supporter of the empire against the claims of the Gregorian papacy, also effectively gave the genre of the universal chronicle to France.<sup>226</sup>

### *A Conclusion but Not the End*

Our discussion of Sigebert concludes our survey of the medieval afterlife of the ancient chronicle genre. The high Middle Ages would work serious changes on the historiographical world, inventing yet more new genres, some of which were very much like chronicles or variations upon them: one thinks, for instance, of the cartulary chronicles of the twelfth century, which arranged in meaningful sequence the ancient documents of a monastery or bishopric in order to prove its antiquity, its rights, and thus its ability to 'out-past' opponents, old or new.<sup>227</sup> Annalistic chronicling does not come to an end with Sigebert: wherever there were local foundations and local interests, perhaps with access to old notes and evidence in their local archives, the temptation to compose locally focused chronicles would exist.<sup>228</sup>

<sup>226</sup> Chazan 1999: 24–25 and *passim*.

<sup>227</sup> See Southern 1973: 249–51. See Chapter 3, note 1, above for 'out-pasting'.

<sup>228</sup> See the *Annales S. Bauonis* (MGH SS, 2: 185–91), seemingly a fourteenth-century composition despite containing local material going back to the Carolingian period, or the thirteenth-century *Annales S. Medardi Suessionensis* (MGH SS, 26: 518–22).

Widely circulated works, like Bede's chronographic treatises, seemed naturally to attract new annotation.<sup>229</sup> Equally, other authors might continue to do what Sigebert had done, placing their own new compositions at the end of massive world chronicles drawing on all the usual chronicle epitome sources of the early Middle Ages.<sup>230</sup> But the chronicle of Sigebert is nevertheless a fine place to bring our survey to a close. Though new in many important ways, Sigebert's chronicle both explicitly interacts with, depends on, and preserves Latin works that form part of a continuous chain linked, at its earliest point, to the chronicling tradition of the ancient Near East. It gives one pause to think that so lowly a genre, one so often despised for all the many things it is not, should also be the genre that links medieval Europe, and thus the modern world, to humanity's very first attempts at remembering its own past accurately through time.

<sup>229</sup> The *Annales Brunwilarenses* (MGH SS, 1: 99–101), from 1000 to 1125, for instance, is jotted in the margins of Bede's *De temporum ratione*.

<sup>230</sup> See, for instance, the extremely abbreviated universal chronicle in Paris, Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal, MS Nouv. acq. lat. 2055 (Vidier 1965: 84–85) or the huge work of Sicard of Cremona (MGH SS, 31: 21–181), which begins with the Incarnation and the start of the Sixth Age and continues via Isidore, Bede, and Jerome to 1218. Chazan 1999 is a fine survey.

## CONCLUSION

**A**lmost every text examined in the foregoing study is chronographic. In one way or another, each is concerned with the orderly reckoning of time's passage as much as, or more than, it is with the flow of historical events within that time. Some chronographic works may affect a certain level of literary pretension, but for the most part they are technical and subliterary, and were regarded as such at the time of composition. This ancient viewpoint has undoubtedly contributed to the modern depreciation of chronographic works, which are compared unfavourably to classicizing histories: those are dominated by literary motives and by explaining the flow of events through history, rather than a mere chronological framework, however precise. The modern comparison is unfair, and in general the ancient and medieval worlds did not make the mistake of indulging in it, as the large number of chronicles written in those periods demonstrates. As most ancient writers and readers knew, chronographic genres served very different purposes from those of literary or classicizing history, and neither type of historical writing was adequate if judged by the standards of the other.<sup>1</sup>

In this series of four volumes, our main interest will be with Latin chronographic traditions, from the time that they first become visible in the first century

<sup>1</sup> This latter, of course, is the origin of the few criticisms of chronographic writing that we find in the ancient world. Eunapius, for instance, as we saw in 'Chapter 1, note 11' of the Appendices to the Footnotes (p. 358 below), had nothing good to say about chronology at all, but he was specifically objecting to the intrusion of chronography into the genre of history, where he believed it had no place. Dionysius, Sempronius Asellio, Plutarch (*ibid.*), and even Cicero (Appendix 2) also voice their lack of enthusiasm for chronographic writing, but again their comments are in the context of direct comparisons between chronographic works and history. As we have seen, Cicero thought very highly of Atticus's chronicle, in its proper context.

BC to the end of the ancient tradition in the late sixth century AD. Within that Latin tradition, it is mainly the works of late antiquity that will occupy us. Late antique Latin chronicles have very ancient roots which lie, on the one hand, in a universal Mediterranean and Near Eastern literary tradition of chronicle writing and, on the other, in a more native Latin chronographic tradition of annotated consular fasti. One of these volumes' novelties is to take in the whole Latin chronographic tradition, treating it on its own terms both as textual product and as source for the reconstruction of later Roman history. A thorough textual understanding of how the various chronographic sources for late antiquity relate to one another can produce surprising results. In particular, we discover that what we thought we knew about the history of the later Roman Empire, and of the fifth century in particular, rests on much less solid foundations than we once believed. Events and chronologies that seem at first glance to be attested by multiple independent sources turn out, upon closer inspection, to derive from a single attestation, repeated many times. As a result, any number of modern reconstructions are based on false, or incomplete, assumptions about what the evidence does and does not tell us. This will become particularly obvious in our commentary to Volume II, which treats the early Latin chronicle tradition and the consularia traditions, early and epigraphic, and later and manuscript, particularly the latter.

To reach such conclusions convincingly, however, one needs a general understanding of how various chronographic genres developed, which in turn requires a firm and fixed vocabulary with which to discuss issues of genre. This first volume has laid out the authors' decisions about nomenclature and genre and then sketched how the genres thus defined went on to develop over time. Although this may have been hard going for the reader, it is nevertheless a necessary prolegomenon to the volumes that follow, for ancient and medieval sources are consistently unhelpful in issues of nomenclature. Latin has a particularly imprecise vocabulary with which to distinguish among historical genres. Greek is superficially more precise — various authors do offer definitions of historical genres — but Greek authors were not consistent in following their own definitions. In light of this fact, our volumes will maintain considerably stricter terminological distinctions than do the ancient sources themselves, or indeed than do most modern scholars. Only by doing so can we ensure that readers will always know exactly what genre we are discussing at any given time.

To reiterate in briefer compass what we discussed at length in Chapter 1, we use 'history' or 'classicizing history' for the major literary works of ancient history, from Herodotus, Thucydides, Xenophon, and Polybius, through Livy, Tacitus, and Ammianus, to Dexippus, Eunapius, and Priscus. These works were complex

literary structures, built around a particular storyline or arc of events. They feature prominent narrative comment and a frequently obtrusive authorial voice, and are often overtly didactic or moralistic. Always, their style is elevated, elaborate, and accessible only to those at the highest levels of literacy. For classicizing history, the precise ordering of events was of less importance than their moral, literary, or interpretative significance.

Histories, then, are to be distinguished from the various chronographic genres with which we are here concerned. Modern scholars use a variety of unstandardized names for these genres, including annals, consularia, chronicles, and fasti. In the ancient world, all these genres were regarded primarily as technical or scientific rather than literary, regardless of what they were called. That was in part because these chronographic genres had developed for a technical reason, to make it possible to ascertain the precise ordering of time, the precise ordering of events through time, or the location of a particular event in time. Because the reckoning of time is primary, chronographic genres present the events of the past paratactically, without any necessary concern for causation or continuity, or any real need for a narrator's intervention. Indeed, to use the language of narratology, the non-chronographic information in chronographic genres is presented in a relationship of *consécution* not *conséquence*.

To distinguish among the several chronographic genres we consider in these volumes, we have deployed a carefully graded vocabulary. One common word that we avoid almost altogether is 'annals'. In different fields of modern scholarship, the word 'annals' — from the Latin *annales* — can refer to a very wide variety of texts, something which reflects the absence of a clear ancient point of reference. If one takes in Near Eastern, classical, and medieval scholarship, there is virtually no type of historical text that is not somewhere referred to as annals. With the potential for confusion so great, we confine our use of the term to contexts in which we are discussing modern historiography. Thus for us a word like 'annalistic' simply means 'year by year' and nothing more.

We use 'chronicle' to describe any historical work that takes a primarily chronographic approach to the record of events in time. Chronicles will have a year-by-year structure (an annalistic structure, properly so called), regardless of whether or not events are recorded for every year and whether or not the chronological lemmata are recorded for those years without textual content; they will be brief in their reporting of past events, though the interpretation of the idea of brevity varies greatly; and they will have a paratactic style in this reporting. Though they can have a fixed beginning (which may, however, be lost in our extant texts), there was no general agreement as to what that beginning should be (Creation, birth of

Abraham, pre-Roman kings in Latium, birth of Christ, and the foundation of a local monastery are all possibilities). On the other hand, they do not have fixed endings, which makes them peculiarly susceptible to continuation, since one chronicler's ending was always the potential beginning for another. They can be the work of a single author or many authors, and they functioned as a kind of handbook, reducing history to a series of dated facts. As a genre, the chronicle is extremely old, and not at all exclusive to the Latin tradition of late antiquity or the Middle Ages. What the present series means by 'chronicle' is thus what most medievalists call 'annals'; that usage was adopted in order to distinguish brief, annalistic, and paratactic texts from the longer and more elaborate products which the later Middle Ages tended to call chronicles or *chroniques*. Yet because the term 'annals' has too many competing meanings, we would urge its abandonment in medieval contexts in favour of 'chronicle', a practice we follow ourselves. For the medieval works that developed as annotations to Easter tables, we have adopted the phrase 'paschal chronicle', treating them as a late-developing subgenre of the ancient chronicle tradition not far removed from consularia, from which they seem to have developed in the sixth century.

We use 'consularia' to describe a genre that is specifically Roman and Latin, in contrast to the widely diffused practice of writing chronicles, though it certainly had analogues in Assyrian eponym chronicles and in Greek chronicles dated by Athenian archons. The term consularia here designates only annotated lists of Roman consuls. The annotations in consularia are briefer than in chronicles and were written in a very specific and readily identifiable style. Only a limited type of content is considered appropriate to the genre: Christian origins, persecution, and martyrdom; the emperor, his family, and their activities; as well as unusual or impressive geological, meteorological, and astronomical events. In fifth- and sixth-century Constantinople, events involving the construction, refurbishment, or destruction of urban buildings, monuments, and statues were also included. Ecclesiastical history is entirely ignored. The limitations of the consularia genre were always felt in Roman antiquity, and by the sixth century it had been entirely subsumed into the chronicle genre.

Initially, consularia developed out of bare lists of consuls and censors, possibly under the influence of early chronicling in Latin, which developed in the first century BC. We use the term 'fasti' to designate these bare lists. In the ancient sources, the word *fasti* had several meanings at different times, but by the late republic it was used most frequently either for lists of the annual consular pairs or for simple calendars of the Roman civil year, in which latter sense it was used, for instance, by Ovid. We have restricted our use of 'fasti' to just one of those two standard late

republican usages. For the other, we simply use the English word calendar. There is a precise correspondence between the English connotations of that word and the Latin use of *fasti* to describe an outline of the Roman civil year, and by using it one avoids any confusion between calendars and consular lists.

History, chronicle, consularia, *fasti*, calendar: these are the terms that we shall deploy consistently throughout the series. Having established these terms, we should nevertheless stress that our distinctions are not intrinsic to the Latin vocabulary, ancient or medieval, which tended to use these and a variety of other words quite indiscriminately. Nevertheless, the genres for which we have specified a rigidly distinct vocabulary were real genres and were observed in practice by the ancients themselves, even in the absence of a consistent nomenclature. In addition, having settled on these terms we have been forced in the interests of greater precision to develop a number of others for what could be called subgenres, such as paschal chronicles, which are chronicles that developed out of Easter tables, and chronicle epitomes, which follow the pattern set by Isidore and Bede and abandon annalistic chronology for a chronological progression by reign, thus becoming a kind of epitomized *breviarium* with a chronographic apparatus. A full list of these new definitions can be found in the addendum at the end of Chapter 1. By creating a consistent generic nomenclature for use in this series, we have made it possible for readers to be certain of the precise ancient genre, and thus the precise type of work, to which we are referring at any given time.

The chapters in this first volume of the series have offered an overview of the whole chronographic tradition of antiquity and the earlier Middle Ages, with particular focus on the chronicle. This survey might seem unnecessarily extensive given the primary focus of the series on the Latin chronographic traditions of late antiquity. It seemed, however, that a survey on such a scale was necessary to counteract the still pervasive sense of chronicle as a distinctively Christian and medieval form, one that developed only during and after the fall of the Roman Empire.<sup>2</sup> By offering a survey of such length, this volume demonstrates that there was in fact a classical chronicle tradition that was a product of the Hellenistic world, with roots that reach back to Assyrian and Babylonian chronicles at the very dawn of western civilization.

Even leaving the ancient Near East to one side, the chronicles of the classical Greek and Roman worlds had an eight-hundred-year-long 'pagan' tradition behind

<sup>2</sup> Most recently by Weiß 2010.

them by the time Jerome came to translate and continue the *Chronici canones* of Eusebius; even at Rome, the indigenous tradition of consularia went back four hundred years before Jerome. The chronicle is not, that is to say, a uniquely or even primarily Christian genre, and the long survey in this volume should make it less tempting to analyse late Roman chronicles in terms of what the genre would become in the Middle Ages. Everything that defines the chronicle genre and sets it apart from other ways of recording past time — its structure, style, and chronology, its methods of narration and composition, its very way of looking at history — was of a non-Christian origin. That a late antique or medieval chronicler happened to be a Christian makes neither his chronicle a ‘Christian chronicle’ nor the genre a Christian one. It just so happened that in a Christian world, as the Middle Ages were and the late Roman Empire quite rapidly became, Christianity was part of the historical past, and therefore part of the material which a historical genre might choose to record.

Chronicles and consularia had a long and fascinating history before the fourth century and continued to develop in important and interesting ways as antiquity ended and the Middle Ages took shape in both East and West. The chronicles and consularia of late antiquity cannot be properly understood without appreciating their place in the continuum of chronographic approaches to describing the past. What is more, placing chronicles in the broad sweep of historical time might go some distance towards dispelling the low regard in which they are so often still held. The first Latin chronicles, as we have seen, were the product of Rome’s highest intellectual circles. They were written, read, and enjoyed by the intellectual and literary giants of the time: Catullus, Atticus, Cicero, and Varro. These men might not regard a chronicle as a great work of literature — it was not, after all, meant to be one — but they did not doubt the genre’s utility and ultimate value. Chronicles were not to be judged against Livy or Tacitus, nor even against Florus or Eutropius, and we ought not to do so either. Chronicles are what they are, and must be judged on that basis, not in comparison with anything else.<sup>3</sup> The fact that the chronicle survived as a genre for thousands of years testifies to its resilience and proves that it had evolved perfectly to do the job it was meant to do. For Cicero, the chronicle of his friend Atticus was a revelation. His excitement and enthusiasm for the work still leap from the pages of the *Brutus* and the *Cato*. If Cicero could delight in a chronicle, there is no reason why we cannot.

<sup>3</sup> One would like to think that this, if nothing else, is the lesson of the development of the study of Late Antiquity over the last forty years.



## APPENDICES

The first, second, sixth, seventh, and eighth appendices are detailed arguments that support points made in earlier chapters, but that are set out here at requisite length in order not to impede the narrative. The third, fourth, and fifth appendices illustrate the nature of the chronicle genre by means of representative translations. Each is listed here in the order in which each topic arises in the chapters above.

The first appendix discusses the origins of the word *χρονικά*/*chronica* and the development of the use of the word in the ancient and Byzantine worlds.

The second discusses the changing definitions of the word *annales* in pre-sixteenth-century Latin. The key points here are, first, that the definition usually employed today by medievalists has no ancient or medieval basis and, second, that the definition that developed in the later Middle Ages and early humanist period (annals = chronicle) is the result of a misunderstanding of several key classical texts that were not actually referring to chronicles.

The sixth appendix is a detailed analysis of the newly discovered Leipzig Chronograph that explains why the work is neither Christian nor a chronicle.

The seventh appendix concerns the nature of Eusebius's source list for secular history, which is preserved in the Armenian translation of his *Chronographia*, and the nature and identity of two Olympiad historians, Cassius Longinus and Thallus, one a chronicler, the other an epitomator (perhaps a chronicler), who are mentioned in that list.

The eighth appendix, 'Livy's Foundation Date', addresses an important, but highly technical, question raised by the evidence presented in Chapter 4 for the date of the foundation of Rome in Roman historians.

The third and fourth appendices, 'Excerpts from Babylonian Chronicles' and 'Greek Chronicles in the Greek and Roman Worlds' are not so much works of

original research as tools of comparison for the reader. They present translations of chronicles from the various cultures whose historiographical stream eventually flows into the ecumenical chronicle tradition of the Roman Empire and Middle Ages. These translations — often of fragmentary or epigraphic texts — have generally been ‘cleaned up’, which involves the removal of the many different types of brackets in the original publications and, in Appendix 3, the various diacritical marks for certain letters in names of Semitic or other Near Eastern origin (though š is rendered as ‘sh’), in order to render them more legible to the general reader. Since a substantial portion of our argument is that the fundamentals of the chronicle genre remained stable across two millennia, it seems valuable to provide a small dossier of translations that readers can use to easily compare to the Latin texts and translations presented in the fifth appendix and eventually in Volumes II, III, and IV. Translations of the Egyptian Royal Annals, which do not directly influence later Greek and Latin chronicles, can be found in Wilkinson 2000. Two selections from Assyrian eponym chronicles appear within the text of Chapter 2, above, and so are not repeated here. The translations in Appendix 3 are excerpted from Glassner 2004; those of Appendix 4 are by RWB and are complete, except in the case of very fragmentary texts.

The fifth appendix, ‘Excerpts from Roman Consularia and Chronicles’, is a selection of texts from future volumes, and once they have appeared, this appendix will be superfluous. At present, however, these excerpts are intended to help readers appreciate the continuous stream of chronicle writing from the texts in Appendix 3, to those in Appendix 4, to those in Appendix 5, to those that are from the Middle Ages, which are so numerous that we merely offer selected suggestions of English translations.<sup>1</sup> We have grouped the consularia first, beginning with the *Fasti Ostienses*, epigraphic consularia from the first century AD. Two excerpts from the *Descriptio consulum* follow, one a group of selections from what appears to be a chronicle of the first century BC plus later Christian additions, and the second a block of material from the period of contemporary compilation that took place in Constantinople. The following text is a composite document created from the *Consularia Vindobonensia*, *Consularia Scaligeriana*, and the *Excerpta Sangallensia*, which all derive from a common ancestor. Next we present a selection from the Greek *Chronicon Paschale*, the last ancient work to be based on consular dating, and consularia that have been expanded into a chronicle. This is the only text in

<sup>1</sup> E.g. Syriac chronicles: Palmer 1993, Witakowski 1996, Harrak 1999. Irish chronicles: Charles-Edwards 2006. English chronicles: Garmonsway 1953, Wallis 1999. Continental chronicles: Scholz 1970, Reuter 1992.

this appendix that has not been translated by RWB; it is the work of Michael and Mary Whitby (1989). This is followed by the entire section of the *Paschale Campanum* that contains historical annotations. Apart from two isolated notices in two manuscripts of Victorius's paschal calendar of 457 (501 and 525), this is the earliest known example of what medievalists would now call 'Easter-table annals' or 'monastic annals' and dates from 512. We move from consularia to chronicles with an excerpt from the very end of Eusebius's *Chronici canones*, the only part of the text that has ever been reconstructed (see Burgess 1999: 21–90, whence this translation). This is matched with a section from the same part of Jerome's translation and expansion of Eusebius for comparative purposes. It is immediately obvious that Jerome has added and changed much. Sections from two later chronicles, those of Prosper (from the 445 edition<sup>2</sup>) and Hydatius, complete the dossier.<sup>3</sup> We hope that these excerpts will give readers a better sense of these early chronicles.

<sup>2</sup> Observant readers will note that this translation does not seem to follow Mommsen's edition. Mommsen privileged the 455 edition of the chronicle, so that one has to reconstruct the text of Prosper's 445 edition from Mommsen's apparatus criticus. So why follow the 445 edition? First of all, just to show how different it can be from the 455 edition, which will justify our handling of the text in Volume III, but also because its text was probably closer to the original 433 edition than was that of 455.

<sup>3</sup> Until our later volumes appear, more complete translations of late antique chronicles and consularia can be found in Burgess 1993 (Hydatius), A. Murray 2000: 62–108 (Prosper, Gallic Chronicles of 452 and 511, Hydatius, and Marius of Avenches), Croke 1995 (Marcellinus *comes*), Favrod 1993 (Marius of Avenches, in French), Muhlberger 1984b (*Consularia Hafniensia*), and Garstad 2012: 273–311 (*Consularia Scaligeriana*).

## Appendix 1

### *The Origin of the Term Χρονικά/Chronica*

The origins of the term ‘chronica’ in Greek and Latin can only be uncovered by sustained attention to the titles of ancient works, for most of which little or nothing beyond the title is known. And even then, since ancient authors were less concerned about a work’s actual title than we are — indeed many works had no title, at least as we understand that term — there can be considerable discrepancies as to what the title of any particular work actually was.

The Greeks had many different terms for the histories that they wrote. Almost all of them were simply descriptions of the focus of the work, usually in the form of a neuter plural, such as *Ιταλικά*, *Ἑλληνικά*, or *Περσικά* (*Italian Affairs*, *Greek Affairs*, *Persian Affairs*) or beginning with *Περί* (‘Concerning’) followed by the genitive of the subject matter. Those that focused on Athens, however, were usually given the title *Ἀθίς* (*History of Athens*), as we saw above. Surprisingly few included the word *ἱστορία*(ν), and those that did usually included an adjective or genitive that described the specific focus of the work. Other common titles included words like *ᾠροί*, *συγγραφή*, *ἀναγραφή*, *κτίσις*, or *πολιτεία* (‘annalistic (history)’, ‘history’, ‘record/register’, ‘foundation’, and ‘constitution’), again with a genitive to describe the focus, usually an area, city, or people.

A small number of titles, however, did not conform to these general rules. Histories that focused on Olympiads or Olympic victors as a means of determining chronology often included the words *Ὀλυμπιάδες* or *Ὀλυμπιονίκαι* in their titles (*Olympiads* and *Olympic Victors*), with no indication of the main focus of the work. The implication was that because it used Olympiad reckoning, which was a universal chronology, it was in some ways universal and so required no specific notification for the reader. Those works that were not simply lists of Olympic victors were, as far as we can tell, chronicles structured according to Olympiads, and so are now referred to as ‘Olympiad chronicles’. Similarly, the title *Χρονογραφία* (*Chronological Analyses/Reckonings*) says nothing about the content, but stresses the work’s obvious interest in chronology. Eratosthenes and Julius Africanus are the only known pre-Byzantine authors to have employed this title for their works (the former with a *περί* in front), though only the first was probably a chronicle by the definition that we have adopted here (see Chapter 3 for Africanus). The title *Χρονογραφία* (in the singular) is also applied to the first part of Eusebius’s chronicle, of which the *Chronici canones* was the second half, though the only

evidence for this is the heading to the Armenian translation and there is no indication that this is original or is a title rather than a simple description.<sup>1</sup>

In the same way, a common title for a larger number of classical and Hellenistic works that seem to have been chronicles of one sort or another is Χρόνοι or Περὶ χρόνων. The usual translation of the word χρόνος is 'time', but here in the plural it rather has a meaning of 'dates' or more technically 'chronology'. In works such as these it is not the country, city, people, or constitution that is the topic but the chronology itself, which makes it more likely that these works had a Hellenistic, universal perspective. Works with such titles are therefore more likely than others to have been chronicles of one sort or another, perhaps even by our definition, which is supported by the small number of books these works contained (when known). However, since nothing survives of them apart from a very few citations and perhaps a quotation or two, we can never truly know. Works with such titles are the chronicles of Phillis of Delos (Müller 1851: 476; not in *FgrHist* or *BNJ*); Sosibius of Laconia (*FgrHist*, 595), c. 250–150 BC;<sup>2</sup> Hippys of Rhegium (*FgrHist*,

<sup>1</sup> Eusebius, *Chron.*, p. 1.1 (it does not appear in Petermann's Latin translation). The same word is used elsewhere in the Armenian text with the meaning 'chronology' or 'chronological calculation' and is translated into Latin by Petermann as 'chronographia' or 'chronologia', and by Karst as 'Chronologie' or sometimes 'Zeitbeschreibung' (2.11; 3.4, 7; 4.7; 9.13; 34.5, 7, 14; 36.3, 37; 37.7, 25; 62.12; 64.8; 74.9; and 142.3). As can be seen in the parallels between the Armenian and the Greek excerpts in Cramer's *Anecdota graeca* and Syncellus from the first volume of Eusebius's work, Eusebius uses the word χρονογραφία and the phrase τῶν χρόνων ἀναγραφή to refer to regnal lists or chronological calculations, and these are translated by Petermann as 'chronographia' or 'chronologia', and by Karst for the most part as 'Zeitbeschreibung', but also as 'Chronographie' and 'Chronologie' (Schoene 1875: 1–2 (= p. 1.14–15, Karst), 75–76 (= p. 36.4, Karst), 79–80 (= p. 38.6, Karst), 95–96 (= p. 45.16, Karst), 97–98 (= p. 47.7, Karst, the title of Africanus's work), 105–06 (= p. 50.18, Karst), 109–10 (= p. 52.8, Karst), 119–20 (= p. 56.20, Karst), 189–90 (= p. 88.33, Karst), and 191–92 (= p. 89.13, Karst)). Note also Eusebius's similar usage in the *HE* ('Appendix 1, note 21' in the Appendices to the Footnotes, pp. 379–80 below). Syncellus's χρονογραφεῖον (*Ecl. chron.*, p. 36.17) is often taken as an indication of the title of the first book, but it means 'chronology' or 'chronological reckoning' as well, just as it does in other places in Syncellus (*Ecl. chron.*, pp. 56.18, 76.24, 91.12, 94.1). Epiphanius, in his *De mensuris et ponderibus* (33; Hultsch 1864: 264), uses χρονογραφίαι to refer to Eusebius's work (and other chronicles), but the definition he cites from it (concerning the Latin word 'congiarium' ('donative')) does not suit Eusebius's first volume and does not appear in either surviving part of the chronicle.

<sup>2</sup> *DNP*, XI, 742–43 (Matthaios) and Clarke 2008: 204. The title of this work is said by Clement of Alexandria to be Χρόνων ἀναγραφή (*Register of Dates*; for this phrase, see previous note) but by Athenaeus to be Περὶ χρόνων (*FgrHist*, F 2 and 3).

554), in five books;<sup>3</sup> Antileon (*FgrHist/BNJ*, 247 (Mori)), in at least two books;<sup>4</sup> Autocharis (*FgrHist/BNJ*, 249 (Mori)); Xenagoras (*FgrHist/BNJ*, 240 (Higbie)), pre-99 BC, in four books;<sup>5</sup> Ptolemy of Mendes (*FgrHist*, 611), pre-mid-first century BC, in at least three books; and Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*FgrHist*, 251), early Augustan period, perhaps in one book.

The major source for the content of the above-mentioned chronicle of Xenagoras is the so-called Lindian Chronicle (which is not, by anyone's definition, a chronicle: see Chapter 2, note 84), which was inscribed in 99 BC. It does not use the actual title of this work in its citations but simply describes it as ἡ χροινικὴ σύνταξις, as it does seven other obviously similar works.<sup>6</sup> Diodorus Siculus, who completed his Roman history c. 30 BC, refers to the *Chronica* of Apollodorus with

<sup>3</sup> The date of Hippias is controversial. There is a growing acceptance that he was a late Hellenistic author pretending to have written around 480 BC (a 'Schwindelautor', as Klaus Meister puts it: *DNP*, v, 611–12). The *Suda* erroneously calls Hippias's work Χρονικά (*FgrHist*, 554 T 1; see F 1, Περὶ χρόνων, according to Zenobius, of the second century AD), a common problem with the *Suda*, which was compiled at a time (c. 1000) when any history or chronicle-like work could have been called by that name (see below), from sources of which the same was true. It likewise calls Dionysius's Χρόνοι by the name Χρονικά (*FgrHist*, 251 F 4; cf. F 1). The source employed by Stephen of Byzantium (sixth century) and the *Etymologicum Magnum* (twelfth century) also call Dexippus's Χρονικὴ ἱστορία (see below) by the name Χρονικά (*FgrHist*, 100 F 3–5). If we accept the identification of Ctesicles and Stesicrides of Athens, it would be the case that Athenaeus calls the Ἀρχόντων καὶ Ὀλυμπιονικῶν ἀναγραφὴ both Χρονικά and Χρόνοι, but this is doubtful (see 'Chapter 2, note 76' in the Appendices to the Footnotes, pp. 363–64 below). See below for other such examples and the reason behind this phenomenon.

<sup>4</sup> Anatole Mori in *BNJ* dates Antileon to the fourth century BC, but that seems unlikely unless he means the very end of the fourth century.

<sup>5</sup> Xenagoras is dated by different scholars to between the fourth and second centuries BC: see Higbie 2003: 74, Clarke 2008: 59 n. 28, *DNP*, xii. 2, 606 (Gärtner), and *BNJ*, 240 (Higbie). A date in the third or second century is much more likely than the fourth in view of the work's title and the overall development of the genre.

<sup>6</sup> Higbie 2003: 73–74, 78, 103–04, 118, 130–31, 132, 138, 194–95, 228; Nicasylos (*FgrHist/BNJ*, 519 (Higbie), at least three books and perhaps mid-third century BC, but probably later); Zeno (*FgrHist/BNJ*, 523 (Champion), at least two books and 160s–150s BC); Timocritus (*FgrHist/BNJ*, 522 (Higbie), at least four books; *BNJ* is incorrect in assigning Timocritus to the sixth century BC, since he relates an event from the first half of the third century (F 6)); Aristion (*FgrHist/BNJ*, 509 (Higbie), more than one book); Onomastus (*FgrHist/BNJ*, 520 (Higbie), at least two books); Hagestratus (*FgrHist/BNJ*, 517 (Higbie), at least two books and after 220s BC); and Hagelochus (*FgrHist/BNJ*, 516 (Higbie), at least eleven books). It also mentions the Συναγωγὴ τῶν χρόνων of Aristonymos as a source (*FgrHist/BNJ*, 510 (Higbie)) and the Χρόνοι of an author whose name does not survive (Higbie 2003: 118, 195). Only Zeno is otherwise known.

the same phrase (*Bibliotheca*, 13. 103. 5), which suggests that it was in the first century BC a generic way of designating what we would call a ‘chronicle’.<sup>7</sup> This is entirely appropriate since the basic meanings of σύνταξις are ‘systematic arrangement’ and ‘organization’, and the English word ‘syntax’, in its grammatical meaning, derives directly from it. A ‘work arranged strictly by chronology’ is an apt description of the sort of work we have in mind.<sup>8</sup>

But the word that was to become synonymous with the genre was χρονικά, a neuter plural substantive adjective that indicates that its subject matter is chronology (literally, ‘chronological matters’), rather than any country, city, or people. Its popularity was a result of its use by Apollodorus as the title for his Χρονικά.<sup>9</sup> While it is true that the earliest references to this title do not appear until the middle and end of the second century AD, owing to a lack of surviving texts that would have named the work over the intervening three hundred and fifty years or so, the unanimity of the citations in Greek and Latin from the Roman period right through into the later Byzantine period proves that this was indeed its title.<sup>10</sup>

<sup>7</sup> Higbie 2003: 194–95.

<sup>8</sup> Eusebius of Caesarea, who had read many earlier chronicles, used a similar expression in the preface to his *Chronici canones* at the beginning of the fourth century (see Chapter 3): ‘ἀντιπαραθεῖς ἐκ παραλλήλου τὸν παρ’ ἐκάστῳ ἔθνει τῶν ἐτῶν ἀριθμὸν χρονικοῦ κανόνος σύνταξιν ἐποιήσαμην’ (‘I have set out the numbering of the years for each nation in parallel columns and I have fixed this in the form of a tabular chronicle’ = Syncellus, *Ecl. chron.*, p. 74.1–3; trans. by Adler and Tuffin 2002: 94). In the same preface he refers to the first volume of his chronicle as ‘ἡ πρὸ ταύτης σύνταξις’ (‘the preceding compilation’; = Syncellus, *Ecl. chron.*, p. 73.25–26). Jerome translates this as ‘prior libellus’ (*Chron. can.*, pref., p. 8). Philodemus, a poet and philosopher of the first century BC, called his chronological history of the Greek philosophical schools Σύνταξις τῶν φιλοσόφων (*Ordering of the Philosophers*; Diogenes Laërtius, *Vitae philosophorum*, 10. 3). Also in the first century BC Diodorus Siculus called Zeno (see note 6 above) ‘ὁ τὰ περὶ ταύτης συντάξάμενος’ (‘the compiler of the history of this [island, Rhodes]’, *Bibliotheca*, 5. 56. 7; *FgrHist*, 523 F 1). Ps-Scymnus says that Apollodorus ‘συνετάξατο [...] χρονογραφίαν’ (‘compiled his chronography’, *Orbis descriptio*, 16 = *FgrHist*, 244 T 2), and Syncellus says he made every effort ‘τὸδε τὸ χρονικὸν συντάξαι’ (*Ecl. chron.*, p. 1.21; ‘to arrange the chronology presented here’, trans. by Adler and Tuffin 2002: 1). Eusebius uses the active participle to describe the compilation of his own chronicle, ‘Χρονικοὺς συντάξαντες κανόνας’ (‘compiling my *Chronological Tables*’, *Eclologiae propheticae*, PG, 22: 1024A), and Constantine Porphyrogenitus, or rather his source, likewise uses the active participle to refer to historians of the reign of Justinian as ‘οἱ τὰ χρονικὰ συντάξαντες’ (‘writers of histories’, *De thematibus*, 1. 2).

<sup>9</sup> For the only known earlier use of the word χρονικά as a title in a historical work, see the discussion in ‘Appendix 1, note 9’ in the Appendices to the Footnotes, pp. 378–79 below.

<sup>10</sup> Apart from Cornelius Nepos (see below), the earliest direct references to the title would seem to be in Phlegon’s *Macrobii* from around the second quarter of the second century (*FgrHist*, 257

Following in Apollodorus's wake, from the second century BC to the second century AD, Euthymenes (*FgrHist*, 243), Andron of Alexandria (*FgrHist*, 246), Xenocrates (*FgrHist*/BNJ, 248 (Mori), in more than one book), Castor of Rhodes (*FgrHist*, 250, in six books), Charax (*FgrHist*, 103 F 15–30, in at least eleven books),<sup>11</sup> Pausanias of Laconia (*FgrHist*, 592), and Diogenianus (not in *FgrHist*)<sup>12</sup> all employed the same title, as did Cornelius Nepos, who produced the first Latin chronicle, a Romanized version of Apollodorus's chronicle, in the first half of the first century BC.<sup>13</sup> Nepos is therefore by far the earliest witness, albeit indirectly, to Apollodorus's title. We also have the example of the Χρονικῶν ἀναγραφὴ (*Register of Chronicles/Chronologies*) of Menander of Ephesus/Pergamon, quoted

F 37 II.80 = *FgrHist*, 244 F 49), which is repeated in Ps-Lucian, *Macrobii*, 22 (Harmon 1913: 238); Aulus Gellius, *Noctes Atticae*, 17. 4. 5 (*FgrHist*, 244 F 43) of c. 180, who explicitly says that the title of the work was 'Chronica': 'Apollodori, scriptoris celebratissimi [...] legimus in libro qui Chronica inscriptus est'; Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata*, 1. 21. 105. 1 (*FgrHist*, 244 F 87), from the very end of the second century or very beginning of the third; and Diogenes Laërtius (*FgrHist*, 244 14–16, 27–34, 36–42, 46, 48, 51) of the first half of the third century. August Lentz included many citations of and quotations from Apollodorus that are found in later Byzantine compilations, especially Stephen of Byzantium, a compiler of c. 530, in his massive reconstruction of the Καθολικὴ προσῳδία of the grammarian Aelius Herodian, who dedicated his work to Marcus Aurelius (Lentz 1867–68; for Stephen and the etymologies, see Dickey 2007: 75–77, 101). While Lentz's work is extremely hypothetical, it is not without merit (see Dyck 1993: 776–83), and so Herodian may indeed have been quoting Apollodorus and the title of his work in the third quarter of the second century AD.

<sup>11</sup> Lentz also included many citations of and quotations from Charax in his reconstructed text of Herodian (see previous note). Whether Lentz's reconstruction is completely accurate or not, Herodian could indeed have used Charax, since the latter's floruit can now be placed in the second quarter of the second century AD on the basis of epigraphic evidence (see Alan Cameron 1976: 64–65, Janiszewski 2006: 22, and *DNP*, II, 1096–97 (Meister)). He was once dated as late as the sixth century. It is often thought that Charax's chronicle was nothing more than a later epitomization of his forty-volume universal history (*FgrHist*, 103 T 1, F 1–14; see *DNP* above), but if Herodian was citing the chronicle almost within Charax's lifetime, it seems safer to treat the chronicle as an independent work.

<sup>12</sup> Diogenianus is known only from the two Byzantine compendia, the *Etymologicum genuinum* and the *Etymologicum magnum* (of the ninth and twelfth centuries respectively; see Dickey 2007: 91–92), the latter derived largely from the former, with reference to the word Αἴλιος (Aelius, the family name of the emperor Hadrian), which dates Diogenianus to the second century (or perhaps later). He was to appear in the unfinished section IV of *FgrHist*.

<sup>13</sup> Aulus Gellius, *NA*, 17. 21. 3: 'ut Cornelius Nepos in primo Chronico de Homero dicit'; and Ausonius, *Ep.* 9 (R. Green 1991: 201): 'Nepotis Chronica [...] ad nobilitatem tuam misi'. For Nepos, see Chapter 2 and Volume II.



by Josephus in his *Jewish Antiquities* and *Against Apion* at the end of the first century AD (*FgrHist/BNJ*, 783 (Naiden); see Chapter 3).<sup>14</sup> It is usually dated to the early part of the second century BC. Finally there is the title of the work usually ascribed to Hippolytus, known from an inscription on the plinth of a statue dated palaeographically to the first half of the third century AD, the Χρονικῶν (βιβλος) (*Book of Chronicles/Chronologies*; see 'Chapter 3, note 73' in the Appendices to the Footnotes, p. 367 below).

By the time of Pliny the Elder (pre-AD 79) 'chronica' had become the normal word in Latin to designate a chronicle,<sup>15</sup> and we see the same usage in the *Noctes Atticae* of Aulus Gellius (c. 180).<sup>16</sup> Since the term is Greek one can only assume that these two Latin authors mirror the situation in Greek during the first two centuries AD, but we have little evidence from Greek itself because of the dearth of Greek works on this subject.

The chronicle of Phlegon of Tralles (discussed in Chapter 2) is known to us under three titles, though two are more likely general descriptions than titles, 'Ολυμπιάδες and Χρονικά, and are given by later writers (*FgrHist*, 257 T 1, F 2, 3, 14, 16c, 17–22 and F 15, 16d, e, respectively), both of them in the case of Stephen of Byzantium. The title given by the bibliophile Photius, 'Ολυμπιονικῶν καὶ χρονικῶν συναγωγὴ (*Collection of Olympic Victors and Chronicles*), is almost

<sup>14</sup> Tatian also calls this work an ἀναγραφὴ (*Oratio ad Graecos*, 37. 1 = T 4), which shows that Josephus's title is accurate. Jacoby took his conjectural title (Βασιλέων πράξεις, *Deeds of (the) Kings*) from what is obviously a description rather than a title in Josephus's *Against Apion*, 1. 116 (T 3c). One is reminded of Demetrius's 'Ἀρχόντων ἀναγραφὴ (discussed in Chapter 2) and various other works of the same period called 'Ολυμπιονικῶν ἀναγραφὴ (*Register of Olympic Victors*; see Christesen 2007: 161–227 for these latter works).

<sup>15</sup> Pliny, *Historia naturalis*, 35. 35 (58): 'quin immo certamen etiam picturae florente eo institutum est Corinthi ac Delphis, primusque omnium certavit cum Timagora Chalcidense, superatus ab eo Pythiis, quod et ipsius Timagorae carmine uetusto apparet, chronicorum errore non dubio' ('Nay more, during the time that Panaenus flourished competitions in painting were actually instituted at Corinth and at Delphi, and on the first occasion of all Panaeus competed against Timagoras of Chalcis, being defeated by him, at the Pythian Games, a fact clearly shown by an ancient poem of Timagoras himself, the chronicles undoubtedly being in error', trans. Rackham 1952: 305).

<sup>16</sup> Aulus Gellius, *NA*, 15. 16. 1: 'Milo Crotoniensis, athleta inlustris, quem in chronicis scriptum est Olympiade <LXII> primum coronatum esse, exitum habuit e uita miserandum et mirandum' ('Milo of Croton, a famous athlete who is said in the chronicles to have been victorious for the first time at the sixty-second Olympiad, departed this life with a lamentable and amazing death') and 17. 21. 1: 'excerpebamus ex libris, qui chronici appellantur' ('I took notes from the books called chronicles'). Note that neither Pliny (previous note) nor Gellius marks this as a new, unusual, or Greek word; they assume their readers will know what they are talking about.

certainly the title given to it by its author (T 3), though Jacoby thinks it should be χρόνων rather than χρονικῶν. As we saw above in note 2, this warns us to be careful about exact titles (not something the Greeks and Romans worried much about anyway) when a work is cited by only a few later authors. In this case, at least, we can see that both a variant of Ὀλυμπιάδες and Χρονικά are actually part of this chronicle's title. That Phlegon was a compilation of many chronicles is implied by the title and by its length, which was fifteen or sixteen books. The third-century chronicle of Cassius Longinus was eighteen books, as we shall see in Appendix 7.2. Now a book is as inconsistent a measurement as a city block is for us, something we can see if we compare one book of Tacitus with one of Eutropius, say. Regardless, however, fifteen or sixteen and eighteen books do imply massive works, veritable Livies of the chronicle genre, and this length is further supported by the excerpt from Phlegon that Photius gives for less than a single Olympiad (translated in Appendix 4, below). So by the second and third centuries we can see that some chronicles had expanded from the perhaps single book of Eratosthenes and four books of Apollodorus to large volumes that included a much wider and more detailed coverage.

Meanwhile the opposite influence is indicated by the work of Dexippus, who wrote in the years immediately following the death of Claudius Gothicus in 270. He called his work Χρονικὴ ἱστορία (*Chronographic History*), and it contained at least twelve books (*FgrHist*/BNJ, 100 (McInerney)).<sup>17</sup> The title and the fact that it was continued by Eunapius, who wrote a full-blown narrative ('classicizing') history, indicate that we are dealing with a work that is more than just a chronicle, though because of Eunapius's detailed description and criticism of Dexippus's annalistic chronology there is no doubt that it was arranged like a chronicle and employed the standard chronicle superstructure of Olympiads, archons, and consuls (*FgrHist*, F 1 and Blockley 1983: 6–10, who also provides a translation).<sup>18</sup> In the inscription his sons erected in Dexippus's honour they call the work a ἱστορίη three times (*FgrHist*, 100 T 4.3, 6, 10). Eunapius most frequently calls it a ἱστορία but also συγγραφή and γραφή, and uses the adjective ἱστορικὸς, words

<sup>17</sup> See Janiszewski 2006: 39–54. The title is known from Eunapius and a later excerptor of Eusebius: *FgrHist*, 100 T 2, F 1, 6 line 20, and F 2. Oddly Photius does not name this work but refers to it as ἕτερον σύντομον ἱστορικόν, which seems to require the noun βιβλίον ('another abbreviated historical work'; T 5), which suggests he was guessing its nature from other references to it.

<sup>18</sup> See Buck 1984 and McInerney's commentary to F 1 in *BNJ*, 100 for Dexippus's work as history rather than chronicle.

that are used of proper history, never of a chronicle. And his attack on Dexippus's devotion to annalistic structure and detailed chronology would be silly if Dexippus had just written a chronicle like any other. So would the fact of continuing a chronicle with a 'proper' history. The criticism arises out of the fact that Dexippus was tricking out history with the clothing of the chronicle, as his title testifies, not just writing another chronicle, which latter project would have been totally unobjectionable. And Eunapius thought that was simply foolish: 'Were [Socrates and Themistocles] great men only during the summer?' (see 'Chapter 1, note 11' in the Appendices to the Footnotes, p. 358 below). So as chronicles were growing longer and more detailed, histories were adopting the detailed chronological superstructure of the chronicle. Without the actual works, unfortunately, we can never be certain of exactly what the structure and content of these works were.

After the second or third century however, it would seem that the term 'chronica' became so common as a generic term that it was rarely used as the title of a work. As a result, a bewildering variety of titles and descriptions was instead employed by Byzantine writers, such as *χρονογραφία*, *χρονογραφείον*, *χρονογράφιον*, *χρονογραφία σύντομος*, *χρονογραφία ιστορία*, *χρονογραφία ἐν συνόψει*, *χρονογραφείον σύντομον*, *ἐκλογή χρονογραφίας*, *χρονογραφικὸν σύντομον*, *χρονικὸν σύντομον*, *χρονικὸν σύνταγμα*, *ἐκλογή τῶν χρονικῶν*, *συναγωγὴ χρόνων*, *βιβλος χρονική*, *χρονικὴ σύγγραφη*, *χρονικὰ συγγράμματα*,<sup>19</sup> *σύνοψις χρονική*, *χρονικὴ διήγησις*, *χρονικὴ ιστορία*, *χρονικὴ ἐπιτομή*, and *χρονικὸν ἐπίτομον*. Some of these works are simply patriarchal and regnal lists, some are chronicles of various sorts, others are epitomes or *breviaria*, and still others are full-blown narrative histories. Nevertheless, the term 'chronica', and now for the first time 'chronicon', was still used as a generic designation for this type of work. Texts whose titles we know, such as those of Phlegon, Julius Africanus, and Eusebius for instance, are very often described by later authors as 'chronica', both in Greek and in Latin. As a result of this trend some of the works noted above, for which we have only a single citation, may have had titles other than *Chronica*; we have no way of knowing. And just as was the case in the medieval West, the word came to be a synonym for 'history' and was applied to narrative histories that bore no resemblance to earlier chronicles: Herodotus, Thucydides, Xenophon, Polybius, Cassius Dio, Malalas, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Josephus, Appian, Diodorus Siculus, Zosimus, John of Antioch, Procopius, Menander Protector, and Theophylact were

<sup>19</sup> Eusebius uses this exact phrase to describe the first volume of his chronicle in his commentary on Isaiah (13. 7; PG, 24: 189A).

all called ‘chronicles’ by later Byzantine authors and compilers.<sup>20</sup> Even a work like the classicizing history of Eunapius, who was so hostile towards chronology, could end up being called a *χρονογραφία* by the *Suda* (F 62.2, Blockley 1983).

In Latin there is no evidence for the use of the word ‘chronica’ between Pliny and Gellius, and Jerome two hundred years later. While one might think that Latin is much poorer in its vocabulary than Greek, the variety of phrases that Jerome used simply to describe Eusebius’s *Chronici canones* (either the original or his own translation of it) is surprising: *χρονικόν*, ‘temporum liber’, ‘temporum canones’, ‘digestio temporum’, ‘chronicorum canonum omnimoda historia et eorum ἐπιτομή’, ‘chronicon omnimodae historiae’, and either ‘chronicum’ or ‘chronica’.<sup>21</sup> Sulpicius Severus, who used the word ‘Chronica’ as the title of his own two-book *breviarium* in 400, Rufinus, and Augustine are the earliest authors we know of who saw the usefulness of Jerome’s new text, and all refer to it or similar works as ‘chronica’ (neuter plural), though Augustine on occasion also uses ‘chronica historia’.<sup>22</sup> Although Augustine sometimes ascribes the work to Eusebius or to Jerome and Eusebius, for the most part he and Severus simply refer to it as ‘chronica’, ‘the chronicle’, so well known were both the work and the term itself. The same is true of Prosper, who refers to Jerome’s chronicle simply as ‘chronica’ in the preface to his chronicle, first composed in 435.<sup>23</sup> In 457, Victorius of Aquitaine referred to

<sup>20</sup> This list is drawn from the two lists of ‘chronica’ to be found at the beginning of *De legationibus* and *De uirtutibus et uitiiis*, tenth-century compilations by Constantine Porphyrogenitus. See also the quotation in note 8 above from the contemporary *De thematibus*, referring to Procopius, Agathias, Menander Protector, and Hesychius Illustis: ‘οἱ τὰ χρονικὰ συντάξαντες’ (‘writers of histories’).

<sup>21</sup> The details of this varied vocabulary are set out in ‘Appendix 1, note 21’ of the Appendices to the Footnotes, pp. 379–80 below.

<sup>22</sup> Sulpicius Severus, *Chronica*, 1. 36. 6, 42. 1, 46. 5, 46. 6; 2. 5. 7, 2. 6. 1; Rufinus, *Apologia contra Hieronymum*, 2. 28, 29, and *HE*, 1. 1. 6, 6. 13. 7, 31. 2 (translating Eusebius’s words *χρονικοὶ κανόνες*, *χρονογραφία* (of Cassian; see ‘Appendix 1, note 21’ in the Appendices to the Footnotes, p. 380 below), and *Χρονογραφίαι* (of Africanus)); and Augustine, *De ciuitate dei*, 4. 6; 8. 11; 16. 16; 18. 8, 27, 31 *bis*, 37, 47, and *Quaestiones in heptateuchum*, 2, *Quaest. de Exodo*, *quaestio* 47 (CSEL, 28. 2, p. 120).

<sup>23</sup> He describes his epitome of Jerome as an ‘epitoma de chronicis’, which seems to be a later reworking of an original ‘Epitoma chronicorum’: Liberatus, a Carthaginian archdeacon writing between 555 and 567, quotes the consular date for 428 and entry 1297 from Prosper’s chronicle but says that they derive from the ‘Epitoma chronicorum’ of ‘Lucentius’ (*Breviarium causae Nestorianorum et Eutychianorum*, 2 (PL, 68: 971); Mommsen 1892: 343). Almost certainly this work is Prosper’s chronicle in a later redaction by a Lucentius. Mommsen, however, turned the phrase

Eusebius, Jerome, and Prosper's chronicles four times as 'chronica' (*Cursus paschalis*, praef. 7). Hydatius refers to the *Chronici canones* of Eusebius as a 'chronografia historia' (praef. 2), no doubt an attempt to show off some Greek learning. Next in line chronologically are Gennadius at the end of the fifth century and Cassiodorus in 519 and then again in the middle of the sixth century. They too use 'chronica' in the neuter plural.<sup>24</sup>

Later Latin authors use the term 'chronica' (neuter plural) quite frequently, and it would seem to be Gregory of Tours among surviving authors who first uses it as a feminine plural and once as a feminine singular.<sup>25</sup>

into Greek ('epitoma chronicôn', from 'epitome de cronicon' in MS A) and like Liberatus used it to refer to Prosper's entire chronicle, not just the epitome of Jerome.

<sup>24</sup> Gennadius, *De uiris illustribus*, 19 and 85, 'Chronica', as the title of the work of Sulpicius Severus (though the majority of the manuscripts have it as a feminine singular, a result of the same corruption suggested in 'Appendix 1, note 21' of the Appendices to the Footnotes, p. 379 below, for Jerome's *Commentarii in Daniele*) and Prosper; and Cassiodorus, *Chronica*, 1365, and *Institutiones*, 1. 17. 2 bis, referring to chronicles generally and to Prosper's.

<sup>25</sup> Gregory of Tours, *Historiae*, 1, praef. (pp. 3.16 and 5.11; fem. plur.), 7 (p. 9.9, fem. sing., the title of Sulpicius's work), 36 (p. 27.4; neut. or fem. plur.); 2, praef. (p. 36.20; neut. or fem. plur.).

## Appendix 2

### *The Meaning of the Word Annales*

In Classical and later Latin, *annales* is for the most part nothing more than a synonym for 'history'.<sup>1</sup> For the medieval period Guenée demonstrates a number of important points: in general the word was rarely used; down to the tenth century (and beyond) it had no connotations apart from its original classical use as a synonym for history; from around the tenth century down to c. 1400, the word was often used as a result of direct influence from a passage in the *Etymologiae* of Isidore of Seville (where it still meant nothing more than history); and by the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries it was just another word for chronicle (Guenée 1973: 1002–03, 1005–06, 1008, 1012, 1014–16).

An analysis of the instances of the word 'annalis, -es' in Brepols's 'Library of Latin Texts' series A and B, Monumenta Germaniae Historica Scriptores, and the Patrologia Latina confirms that 'annales' is almost universally a synonym for 'historia'/'historiae' or 'the written record of the past'. Often one finds the two linked, as in 'historiae et annales', 'historiae annalesque', and 'historiae uel annales', and as tautological subjects of different verbs, such as in Peter Damian's eleventh-century 'Scribantur annales, texatur hystoria, quae dicat quia Nerua, clementissimus imperator, pacificauit aecclesiam, Constantinus confirmauit, Theodosius exaltauit' (*Ep.* 120, PL, 144: 438B; 'Let annals be written and history composed to say that Nerva, the most gentle emperor, brought peace to the church, Constantine strengthened it, and Theodosius exalted it'). He also uses the two words interchangeably in the expression 'testantur annales' and 'testatur historia/hystoria'. 'Annalis' can also be used as an adjective with 'historia, -ae', with the meaning 'annalistic', that is, year by year. One finds quotations from Jerome's translation of Esther, 'historiis et annalibus' and 'historias et annales priorum temporum' (2. 23 and 6. 1), and the frequently paired 'annales' and 'historiae' might well show influence from these passages. The word is frequently found in the phrases 'annales regum' and 'libri annales', the latter being a classical phrase. There are at least two examples of Orosius's *Historiae contra paganos* being called 'annales', one from the late eleventh century and another from the early thirteenth, again demonstrating that the word simply means 'history': 'Ait enim de his in Annalibus suis Orosius' (Ebrard of Watten, *Chronica*, PL, 149: 1514A) and 'Ex his Orosius et Eusebius et alii quam

<sup>1</sup> See Wiseman 1979: 9–26, Verbrugghe 1989, Croke 2001b: 297–99, and Northwood 2007: 97–99.

plures libros annales ediderunt' (Burchard of Ursberg, *Chronicon*, MGH SS, 23: 337). In the eleventh century, Ademar of Chabannes, in order to further his fictitious claims that Martial, the local third-century saint, was in fact a secretary of Peter and an original apostle, claimed that entries concerning his birth could be found 'in quibusdam annalibus', by which of course he meant chronicles, like Eusebius-Jerome (*Ep. de apostolatu sancti Martialis*, PL, 141: 110C). Ekkehard of Aura (died 1126) says that 'writers of histories' wrote 'annals' ('Ab hoc itaque loco [forty-third year of Ninus] omnes hystoriarum scriptores incipiunt annales', *Chronicon uniuersale*, PL, 154: 506A).

From the twelfth century to the fifteenth there are a small number of examples of the pairing phenomenon seen above but expressed with forms of 'chronica' and 'annales', including the combination 'annales chronicae' (or 'annalia chronica': two instances are in the form 'annalibus cronicis', disguising the gender).

Probably the most interesting comment is that of Walafrid Strabo in his preface to Thegan's short history of Louis the Pious, written 836–37. He says, 'Hoc opusculum in morem annalium Thegan, natione Francus, Treuirensis ecclesiae chorepiscopus, breuiter quidem, et uere potius quam lepide, composuit' (PL, 106: 405A; 'Thegan, a Frank and *corepiscopus* of the church of Trier, composed this little work in the manner of "annales". It is indeed short and written truthfully rather than elegantly'). In spite of what one might imagine from this description, the work looks nothing like a chronicle or what medievalists call 'annals': the text was written in a single block, not in a tabular format (that is a result of modern editorial intervention for clarity), and only one year is stated, 813, in the first line and in words not figures. Thereafter, most new years down to 835 are marked with either 'Sequenti (uero) anno' or 'Alio (uero) anno' (i.e. no numbers). Some sections are introduced with 'eodem anno' and 'ipso eodemque anno'. It is clearly a narrative history, like a *breuiarium*, but it is annalistic. However, that does not make it annals. Walafrid's introduction can only be understood in terms of what he is comparing Thegan's history to, and what Thegan's major source and inspiration was, Einhard's *Life of Charlemagne*, which was thematic in structure, long, and written in a high classical style, characteristics it derived from Suetonius's *Lives of the Caesars*. Walafrid is therefore drawing attention to the aspects in which Thegan's work is violating the genre boundaries and making his work more like 'annales' ('annalistic history', since he seems to be emphasizing the root meaning of this word) rather than 'gesta' or 'uita' (biography).

Attempts to claim a different meaning for 'annales' are usually caught up in circular reasoning. Take the following quotation, for example:

In the preface to his Life of St. Benedict of [Aniane, of 821/22; PL, 103: 355A], the ninth-century Ardo of Aniane [southern France] notes *Per antiquam siquidem fore consuetudinem actenus regibus usitatam, quaeque geruntur acciduntue annalibus tradi posteris cognoscenda, nemo, ut reor, ambigit doctus* (An educated person does not doubt, I am sure, that it is a very old custom, still used by kings, to pass on everything that was done or happened in annals, so that posterity might know). As Ardo, like his master Benedict of Aniane (the 'second Benedict'), was connected with the Carolingian court in Aachen, we can only surmise that by *annales* he was thinking of those works associated with that court which we still today call imperial annals. As a Benedictine, however, Ardo would also have been familiar with the monastic annals, a tradition which in his day was already three hundred years old, and would continue until early modern times. At least by the end of this period, the word *annales* was inextricably linked to this class of historical text. (Dunphy 2010b: 45)

However, in the light of what we have seen above and the definition provided — a text written 'to pass on everything that was done or happened [...] so that posterity might know' — we can see that by 'annals' Ardo simply means 'histories' or even just 'written records/accounts'. Nothing else is implied by this description. Ardo is speaking of a 'per antiqua consuetudo' and so uses an old-fashioned word to describe the works to which he was referring. There is nothing in the context of this preface that suggests otherwise, and Dunphy imports the standard definition into the passage (as would most medieval scholars today, we suspect), as we can see when he says 'which we *still* today call imperial annals' (our emphasis) and 'the word *annales* was inextricably linked to *this class* of historical text' (our emphasis). It must be emphasized that the name *annales* for the *Annales regni Francorum*, the 'imperial annals' Dunphy is thinking of here, is nineteenth-century (bestowed by Leopold von Ranke), and none of the scores of texts now called *annales* is so entitled in the manuscripts. As a result, and as we have already seen above, the word *annales* cannot be linked to any specific class of historical text in the ninth century. But even if Ardo did indeed have this specific work in mind, his use of the word *annales* to describe it does not prove that this work defined that word nor that Ardo would have distinguished *annales* from *chronica* or *historia*. Since what medieval scholars call 'annals' are histories and *annales* is another word for 'history', it should not surprise us if at least some writers attach the word *annales* to histories that we would now call 'annals'.<sup>2</sup>

As noted above, the early influence of Isidore becomes an important determinant in the frequency of the appearance of this word, but he says nothing relevant to medieval 'annals' as the term is now understood.

<sup>2</sup> One might also ask where Ardo got this interesting idea of what ancient kings did. One suspects that his 'quaeque geruntur acciduntue' are the 'quaequae [...] digna memoriae domi militiaeque, mari ac terrae' of Isidore (see below).



1. Genus historiae triplex est. Ephemeris namque appellatur unius diei gestio. Hoc apud nos diarium uocatur. Nam quod Latini diurnum, Graeci ephemerida dicunt. 2. Kalendaria appellantur, quae in menses singulos digeruntur. 3. Annales sunt res singulorum annorum. Quaequae enim digna memoriae domi militiaeque, mari ac terrae per annos in commentariis acta sunt, ab anniuersariis gestis annales nominauerunt. 4. Historia autem multorum annorum uel temporum est, cuius diligentia annui commentarii in libris delati sunt. Inter historiam autem et annales hoc interest, quod historia est eorum temporum quae uidimus, annales vero sunt eorum annorum quos aetas nostra non nouit. Vnde Sallustius ex historia, Liuius, Eusebius et Hieronymus ex annalibus et historia constant. (Isidore, *Etymologiae*, 1. 44. 1–4)

[1. There are three kinds of history. That which is concerned with the actions of a single day is called an *ephemeris*. We call it a diary. For the Greek word *ephemeris* is the Latin word 'daily'. 2. *Kalendaria* are accounts arranged according to each month. 3. Annals are the events of individual years. (A collection) of whatever domestic or military events worthy of memory, at sea and on land, that are put down in note books each year is called annals from the fact that these events happen every year. 4. History covers many years or periods, diligently transferred from the annual notes into books. The difference between history and annals is that history concerns the times that we live in and annals are about the years of which we have had no experience. Consequently Sallust wrote history, but Livy, Eusebius, and Jerome wrote annals and history.]<sup>3</sup>

The definition in section four along with two other parallel definitions — Servius, *Commentarius in Aeneidem*, 1. 373 and *Scholia ad Lucanum*, 5. 384 (all quoted by Verbrugghe 1989: 222–24) — derive from Aulus Gellius, *NA*, 5. 18. 1–7, who in turn depended upon Verrius Flaccus's *De uerborum significatu*, a work of the Augustan period (see Verbrugghe 1989: 216–18, esp. for Isidore, and p. 222).<sup>4</sup>

The important point here for medievalists is that there is no compositional difference implied by Isidore between 'annals' and 'history'. It is simply a distinction that relates to the time period each covered. Isidore has added Eusebius-Jerome to what his original source said, but his point is correct: Sallust wrote about events of the recent past, while Livy and Eusebius-Jerome wrote about the distant past for the most part but continued down to their own times. It should be noted, however, that in spite of Flaccus's definition and its multiple repetitions by late authors, we have no evidence that any Roman historian ever used these terms in this way: it may have been a completely academic approach to the terminology,

<sup>3</sup> Clearly Isidore has compiled a number of differing and contradictory definitions here, some of which have been concocted merely on the basis of the etymologies.

<sup>4</sup> On this definition, see Potter 1999: 10–11, Sabbah 2003: 46–47, Barnes 2004: 123, and in particular Verbrugghe 1989: 195 and 222 n. 82. This is the same Verrius Flaccus we met in Chapter 4.

known only to grammarians, and Gellius says that even Flaccus doubted it (*NA*, 5. 18. 2).<sup>5</sup>

Gervase of Canterbury, a historian of the end of the twelfth and the first years of the thirteenth centuries, and today probably the most quoted author on the distinctions between history (*historia*) and chronicle (*cronica*), wrote the earliest surviving work to record the word *annales* as having a special meaning different from all earlier and later authors before the humanist period: he uses it as an exact synonym for *cronica* in contradistinction to history: ‘annalibus, quae alio nomine cronica nuncupantur’, ‘cronicas uel annales’, and ‘de annalium uel cronicarum materia’ (*Chronica*, prol.; pp. 87, 89). Otherwise, he only uses the word *cronica*, as well as *cronicus* and *compotista* (‘chronicler’), in his analysis.<sup>6</sup> As we saw above (p. 288), some later writers do pair ‘annales’ with ‘chronicae’ as a tautologous pair (which is not surprising given that both simply mean ‘history’), but no one then distinguishes those two generically from history. Since ‘annales’ was normally just an old-fashioned word for ‘history’, something quite specific must have prompted Gervase or his source to have so closely linked annals and chronicles, and contrasted them with history. The only possible inspirations must have been Aulus Gellius and Cicero.

As we noted above, in his *Noctes Atticae*, Aulus Gellius attempts to explain the difference between ‘historia’ and ‘annales’. He quotes Verrius Flaccus and then says

<sup>5</sup> As noted in Chapter 1, the titles of Tacitus’s *Histories* and *Annals* were assigned in the sixteenth century on the basis of these definitions from Isidore and Gellius (see below).

<sup>6</sup> For Gervase, see Hayward 2010. Hayward’s comment, that Gervase’s ‘much quoted discussion of the differences between “chronicles” and “histories” needs to be seen as a rhetorical construct rather than as a serious discussion of the different genres of history and their uses’ (p. 691), would be easier to accept if Gervase’s descriptions did not mirror not only reality but what other writers in Latin and Greek also said (see Dunphy 2010a: 277). Anselm of Havelberg, writing c. 1150, seems to equate *chronica* and *annales libri* in very much the way that Gervase would fifty years later: ‘iuxta narrationem historiae quae in chronicis, id est in annalibus libris, legitur’ (*Anticeimenon: Dialogus*, 3. 14; PL, 188: 1231A). However, while this does equate the two terms, *chronica* is almost certainly a synonym for *historiae* (i.e. written account of the past), used because of the appearance of *historia* (i.e. the events of the past) in the previous clause in order to avoid a repetition of *historia*. Otherwise, in this text only the word *historia*, -ae is used to refer to a written work of history (3. 6, 1216C; 3. 7, 1217D; 3. 8, 1219A; 3. 16, 1233A, C; 3. 21, 1246A, *Bbis*). The real oddity in this passage is that at first glance it looks as though Anselm believes that the word *chronica* is an unfamiliar word that needs a definition. It is more likely, however, that Anselm is just adding yet another example of *uariatio* and providing yet a different way of saying history. Thus *historia*, *chronica*, and *annales libri* are all the same here and are not being distinguished from one another, which is what we would expect on the basis of all the other contemporary evidence.

that the general view was that annals were histories, but histories were not necessarily annals. He goes on to say, using a strictly etymological explanation based on the meanings of the words,

Ita historias quidem esse aiunt rerum gestarum uel expositionem uel demonstrationem uel quo alio nomine id dicendum est; annales uero esse, cum res gestae plurium annorum, obseruato cuiusque anni ordine, deinceps componuntur. (*NA*, 5. 18. 6)

[Thus they say that history is the setting forth of events or their description or whatever term may be used; but that annals set down the events of many years successively, with observance of the chronological order.] (I, 435)

After a slight digression, he continues by quoting Sempronius Asellio, a historian of the late republic whose work extended from perhaps 146 BC to at least 91 BC. Here Asellio attacks the early works of Roman history, for which he uses the word ‘*annales*’ in a clearly pejorative sense:<sup>7</sup>

Verum inter eos [...] qui annales relinquere uoluissent et eos qui res gestas a Romanis perscribere conati essent, omnium rerum hoc interfuit. Annales libri tantummodo quod factum quoque anno gestum sit, ea demonstrabant, id est quasi qui diarium scribunt, quam Graeci ἐφημερίδα uocant. Nobis non modo satis esse uideo quod factum esset id pronuntiare, sed etiam quo consilio quaque ratione gesta essent demonstrare [...]. Nam neque alacriores [...] ad rempublicam defendendam, neque segniores ad rem perperam faciendam annales libri commouere quicquam possunt. Scribere autem bellum initum quo consule et quo confectum sit et quis triumphans introierit ex eo, et eo libro quae in bello gesta sint non praedicare aut interea quid senatus decreuerit aut quae lex rogatione lata sit neque quibus consiliis ea gesta sint iterare: id fabulas pueris est narrare, non historias scribere. (Aulus Gellius, *NA*, 5. 18. 8–9 = Asellio frags 1–2 = Chassignet 1999: 84–85)

[But between those [...] who have desired to leave us annals, and those who have tried to write the history of the Roman people, there was this essential difference. The books of annals merely made known what happened and in what year it happened, which is like writing a diary, which the Greeks call ἐφημερίς. For my part, I realize that it is not enough to make known what has been done, but that one should also show with what purpose and for what reason things were done [...]. For annals cannot in any way make men more eager to defend their country or more reluctant to do wrong. Furthermore, to write over and over again in whose consulship a war was begun and ended, and who in consequence entered the city in a triumph and in that book not to state what happened in the course of the war, what decrees the senate made during that time, or what law or bill was passed,

<sup>7</sup> *Contra* Verbrughe 1989: 209–11, 219–21, we believe that these views reflect the perceived character of the early annalists and thus the sense that authors could use the word *annales* in this pejorative manner (‘just a bunch of facts strung together in chronological order’). See just below for the same attitude from Cicero.

and with what motives these things were done — that is to tell stories to children, not to write history.] (I, 435 and 437)<sup>8</sup>

Cicero makes the same distinction between dull, factual ‘annals’ and ‘proper’ (i.e. fully developed Greek-style) history:

Erat enim historia nihil aliud nisi annalium confectio [where ‘annales’ = ‘res omnes singulorum annorum’] [...]. Hanc similitudinem [sc. annalibus maximis] scribendi multi secuti sunt, qui sine ullis ornamentis monumenta solum temporum hominum locorum gestarumque rerum reliquerunt [...] unam dicendi laudem putant esse breuitatem [...] non exornatores rerum, sed tantummodo narratores fuerunt. (*De oratore*, 2, 52–54)

[For history used to be nothing more than the compilation of individual events [...]. This method of writing history was adopted by many, who, without any stylistic elaboration, left behind a bare record of chronologies, names of men, places, and events [...]. They regard brevity as the sole merit of writing [...]. They did not enliven the facts, they just reported them.]<sup>9</sup>

<sup>8</sup> On the distinction between *annales* and *historia* in this context, see Verbrugghe 1989: 216–21 and Chassignet 1999: lvii. It must be emphasized that Asellio’s *annales* — and those of Cicero (see below) — are the *annales* of the (perhaps third), second, and first century BC Roman Republic, not the works medievalists call ‘annals’. Early republican *annales* were not anything like a chronicle but were large, multi-volume narrative works, like Livy, that were filled with copious catalogues of historical minutiae, lists of magistrates, and little or no analysis, didactic content, or effort at an elevated style, all dated by pairs of consuls for hundreds of years, as best as could be reconstructed (or invented). Anyone who has had to read Livy books 2–10 will have some sense of what Asellio and Cicero are complaining about, though Livy does his best to enliven and explicate what must have originally been very dry catalogues of deeds and facts. As we saw in Chapter 4, the title ‘annales’ derives from Ennius’s epic poem of the early second century BC and when used to describe these particular republican works is quite modern. Cicero’s attitude towards what he regarded as compendious annual reports of historical minutiae was quite different from his attitude towards a real chronicle, Atticus’s *Liber annalis*, which stands directly in the generic line we define as chronicle in the present work. For a recent overview of the annalistic history writing in the Roman Republic, see Gotter and others 2003, with a bibliography.

<sup>9</sup> For Cicero, ‘proper’ history demands a high style and a range of commentary from the writer, provides pleasure to the reader, and elicits from him a varying emotional response: see *De oratore*, 2, 51–64 and 62–64, an outline of the proper, developed historical style. See also *Ep. ad familiares*, 5. 12. 4–5. It must be noted, however, that much of Cicero’s description in *De oratore* is based upon Greek attempts to analyse the origins of their own historiography, like that by Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *De Thucydide*, 5–7, which in their view began with chronicles and ὥροι (see e.g. Toye 1995, esp. pp. 298–99, with specific reference to this passage of Cicero); it is not specifically based on Latin historiography, though Cicero plugged in the Roman works that matched these descriptions. But medieval readers of Cicero would not have known this.

Etenim ordo ipse annalium mediocriter nos retinet quasi enumeratione fastorum. (*Ep. ad familiares*, 5. 12. 5)

[Indeed, the simple listing of events year by year isn't really any more interesting than reciting a list of consuls.]

Asellio and Cicero's descriptions of *annales* makes them sound exactly like chronicles, and it seems likely, therefore, that Gervase, or another author of whom he had knowledge, had read Gellius and Cicero and that it was these that led him to believe that 'annals' was the classical Roman name for 'chronicles'.<sup>10</sup> From a medieval point of view, what else could they be describing? In fact, these descriptions have fooled even modern scholars into thinking the same thing, and therefore linking Roman 'annals' and medieval 'annals'.<sup>11</sup> There is certainly nothing in Isidore, who *was* widely known at the time, or any other known text, that would have led to the explicit equation of chronicles and annals and the distinction of those works from history by Gervase or any of his contemporaries. Without Gellius and Cicero the identification and distinction cannot be explained.

Though Gervase's history was not widely known on the Continent for some time afterwards, his identification of 'chronica' and 'annales' eventually came to be widely accepted. However, it is not likely to have been Gervase's text that prompted this change in terminology, but rather the renewed interest in Gellius throughout Europe from the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries.<sup>12</sup> As a

<sup>10</sup> For the text of Gellius in the Middle Ages, see Reynolds 1983: 176–78 and Marshall and others 1980, esp. pp. 369–74: books one to seven (the quotation from Asellio is in book five) were known in northern France from the second half of the ninth century and began to circulate freely in the twelfth in England and France. Radulphus de Diceto, dean of St Paul's in London from c. 1180 to c. 1202, had read a complete manuscript of Gellius in the last quarter of the twelfth century, around the same time that Gervase was writing, and even quoted from *NA*, 5. 18. 1 and 6 in his *Abbreviationes chronicorum* (Stubbs 1876: 15), so it is quite possible for Gervase to have read either Gellius himself or at least the work of some other English historian who had done so. For a knowledge of Cicero, see Guenée 1973: 1005, and n. 45, where he attributes Gervase's understanding of 'annales' to Cicero rather than Gellius. For the active copying of manuscripts of Cicero's *De oratore* after the ninth century, see Reynolds 1983: 102–07.

<sup>11</sup> Stubbs (1867: x–xi) is the earliest of modern medievalists that we have found to fall into this trap, but even classicists have been seduced by this belief: John Rolfe, in his translation of Gellius in LCL, translates 'annales' as 'annals' in every case but one: in Gellius's introduction to his quotation from Asellio, Rolfe translates 'inter res gestas et annales' as 'between history and chronicle'.

<sup>12</sup> See Guenée 1973: 1014–15 for Gellius's later influence, along with Reynolds 1983: 179 and n. 17 (over ninety fifteenth-century manuscripts are known) and *LMA*, IV, 1205–06 (Brunhölzl). For Cicero's importance after 1400, see Guenée 1973: 1011–12.

result, in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries it was regularly accepted that ‘annals’ was nothing more than a synonym for ‘chronicles’, and some could even claim that *annales* was in fact Latin for *chronica*.<sup>13</sup> But at no point during this entire period are annals ever distinguished from chronicles as they are nowadays by medievalists.

All of which is to say, if one leaves Gervase aside, it is really only after the Middle Ages that ‘annals’ came to be treated as a synonym for chronicle and thus to mean anything other than ‘history’. That early modern meaning, in turn, is simply the result of a late misunderstanding of classical texts that were not actually discussing the type of work that their late readers thought they were. There is no evidence that the word ‘annals’ was ever contrasted with ‘chronicle’ in any way. Thus the current distinction between annals and chronicles is very recent and should be abandoned, since it and the assumptions that accompany it seriously impede our understanding of medieval historiography.

<sup>13</sup> See Dunphy 2010a: 275 and 278: Ambrogio Calepino, the famous Italian lexicographer, gave the following definition in his dictionary of 1502: ‘Chronica, -orum, generis neu. non chronica, -cae, ut indocti usurpant, latine temporalia dicuntur, proprie annales’ (‘Chronica, -orum, gender neuter, not “chronica, -cae”, as the uneducated say, means in Latin “times”, or properly speaking “annals”’); and Heinrich Bebel, the German humanist, wrote in 1503, ‘Annales igitur sunt quae nostri graeco uocabulo chronica nominant’ (‘Annals, then, are what we call “chronicles” in Greek’).

### Appendix 3

#### *Excerpts from Babylonian Chronicles*

Complete translations of all Sumerian, Assyrian, and Babylonian chronicles mentioned in Chapter 2 can be found in Glassner 2004 and Grayson 1975. We present here a few excerpts for immediate comparison with later Greek and Latin chronicles. [...] indicates missing text in the original.

#### **1. Neo-Babylonian Chronicle Fragment (= Chronicle 16 iii. 28 – iv. 8, 30–38;<sup>1</sup> Glassner 2004: 199, 201, 203)**

In the month of Teshrit, at noon, the twenty-third day, King Humban-haltash of Elam fell ill. He died at sunset. Humban-haltash reigned eight years over Elam. Humban-haltash (II), his son, ascended the throne. In the month of Tebeth, the twentieth day, during an insurrection, the son of King Sennacherib of Assyria killed his father. Sennacherib reigned twenty-four years over Assyria. In Assyria, the insurrection lasted from the month of Tebeth, the twentieth day, to the month of Adar, the second day. In the month of Adar, the twenty-eighth (?) day, Esarhaddon, his son, ascended the throne of Assyria. (681 BC)

The first year (of the reign) of Esarhaddon, Nabu-zer-kitti-lisir, governor of the Sealand, having gone upstream, set up camp before Ur but did not take the city. He fled before the leaders of Assyria and reached Elam. In Elam, the king of Elam captured him and caused him to be executed. In an unknown month, at Nippur, the governor [...]. In the month of Elul, Ishtaran and the gods of Der went from [...] to Der. [...] went to Dur-Sharrukin [...]. In the month of Adar [...]. (680 BC)

The second year, the majordomo carried out a selection in Akkad [...]. (679 BC)

The third year [...] -ahhe-shullim, governor of Nippur, and Shamash-ibni, the Dakkurean, were deported to Assyria and executed. (678 BC)

The fourth year, Sidon was taken and plundered. The same year, the majordomo carried out a selection in Akkad. (677 BC)

The fifth year, in the month Teshrit, the second day, the army of Assyria took Baza. In the month of Teshrit, the head of the king of Sidon was cut off and carried to Assyria. In the month of Adar, the head of the king of Kundu and Sisu was cut off and carried to Assyria. (676 BC)

<sup>1</sup> = Chronicle no. 17 iv.1–6 (Glassner 2004: 207) and Chronicle 18 1–16, 31–33 (Glassner 2004: 207, 209).

\* \* \*

The twelfth year, the king of Assyria marched on Misir. On the way he fell ill and, in the month of Arahsumnu, the tenth day, he went to his destiny. Esarhad-don reigned twelve years over Assyria. His two sons ascended the throne, Shamash-shuma-ukin in Babylon, Ashurbanipal in Assyria. (669 BC)

The year of the accession of Shamash-shuma-ukin, in the month of Iyyar, Bel and the gods of Akkad left Ashur; they entered Babylon in the month of Iyyar, the fourteenth/twenty-fourth day. The same year, Kirbitum was taken, its king captured. In the month of Tebeth, the twentieth day, Bel-etir, the judge of Babylon, was arrested and executed. (669–668 BC)

First section, copied, reread, and checked according to its ancient model, tablet of Ana-Bel-eresh, son of Liblutu, descendent of Ur-nanna. Babylon, month of [...], sixth day, the twenty-second year (of the reign) of Darius (I), king of Babylon, king of all lands. (501–500 BC)

## **2. Neo-Babylonian Chronicle Fragment (= Chronicle 21 18–38; Glassner 2004: 217, 219)**

The first year (of the reign) of Nabopolassar, in the month of Nisan, the seventeenth day, panic reigned in the city (= Babylon). Shamash and the gods of Shapazza came to Babylon. In the month of Iyyar, the twenty-first day, the Assyrian troops entered Raqmat; they took away its treasures. In the month of [...], the twentieth day, the gods of Sippar came to Babylon, and in the month of Ab, the ninth day, Nabopolassar came to Raqmat with his troops and joined battle for Raqmat but did not take the city. The Assyrian troops arrived; he retreated before them and withdrew. (625 BC)

The second year (of the reign) of Nabopolassar, at the beginning of the month of Elul, the Assyrian troops went down to Akkad and maintained their quarters near the canal Banitu. They joined battle with Nabopolassar without any result. The Assyrian troops broke up camp and made their way back. (624 BC)

The third year, in the month of [...], the eighth day, Der rebelled against Assyria. In the month of Teshrit, the fifteenth day, Itti-ili (?) joined battle with Nippur (?). The same year, the king of Assyria went down to Akkad with his troops and took possession of Der; he took out its treasures and had them sent to Nippur. He pursued Itti-ili, ravaged Uruk (?), and set up a garrison at Nippur. In the month of [...] went up from beyond the Euphrates and set out towards Assyria. He plundered [...] and set out towards Nineveh. When the troops of King Sin-shar-ishkun



of Assyria, which had moved for the engagement [...], saw him, they threw themselves down on the ground before him in a sign of submission. (623 BC)

### **3. Neo-Babylonian Chronicle Fragment (= Chronicle 26 iii.5–26; Glassner 2004: 237, 239)**

The seventeenth year (of Nabonidus), in the month of Nisan, Nabu went from Borsippa to the procession of Bel. Bel went out. In the month of Tebeth, the king entered the Etur-kalama. In the temple (?) [...] he offered a wine libation [...]. Bel went out. The New Year's festival was celebrated as in normal times. In the month of [...] Lugal-Marada and the gods of Marad, Zababa and the gods of Kish, Ninlil and the gods of Hursag-kalama entered Babylon. Until the end of the month of Elul, the gods of Akkad [...] upstream and downstream from Isin (?) entered Babylon. The gods of Borsippa, Cutha, and Sippar did not enter. In the month of Teshrit, Cyrus having joined battle with the army of Akkad at Upu on the bank of the Tigris, the people of Akkad fell back. He pillaged and massacred the population. The fourteenth (day of Teshrit), Sippar was taken without a struggle. Nabonidus fled. The sixteenth, Governor Ugbaru of Gutium and the army of Cyrus made their entrance into Babylon without fighting. Later, having returned, Nabonidus was taken in Babylon. Until the end of the month, the shield-carriers of Gutium encircled the gates of the Esagila, but there was no interruption of rites of any kind in the Esagila or in any other temple and no festival date was missed. In the month of Arahsamnu, the third day, Cyrus entered Babylon. Drinking straws (?) were filled up before him. Peace reigned in the city; Cyrus decreed peace for all Babylon. He installed Gubaru as governor of all the governors in Babylon. From Kislev to Adar, the gods of Akkad that Nabonidus had sent to Babylon returned to their sanctuaries. In the month of Arahsamnu, the night of the eleventh day, Ugbaru died. In the month of [...], the queen died. From the twenty-seventh day of Adar to the third day of Nisan there was mourning in Akkad. All the inhabitants covered their heads. The fourth day, as Cambyses, son of Cyrus, went to Egidri-kalama-sumu, on his arrival, the one in charge of the Egidri of Nabu who [...] the scepter, did not let him take (?) the hand of Nabu because of his Elamite dress. (539 BC)

### **4. The Religious Chronicle (= Chronicle 51 ii.9–15; Glassner 2004: 299)**

In the month of Dumuzi, a wolf was lurking in the west, and they killed it. In the month of Ab, physicians having [...], saw a badger at the Gate of Urash, in front of

the door of the administrator. In the month of Teshrit, the twenty-fifth day, they killed a live panther drifting down the river (Euphrates) behind the Egidri-kalamasuma and pulled it up to dry land.

In the month Ab of the seventh year <of Simbar-shihu? = 1020 BC>, the sixteenth day, two deer that had come into Babylon were killed. In the month of Siwan of the seventh year, the twenty-sixth day, the day grew dark and in the sky fiery [...].

In the month of Elul of the eleventh year, water flowed out of the wall of the lower forecourt.

\* \* \*

In the month of Iyyar of the seventeenth year, the fourteenth day, the outer wall of the Gate of Urash was seen to have shifted.

In the month of Siwan of the eighteenth (?) year, the fifteenth day, a [...] of water coming down from the Gate of Ishtar toward the river and entering into Babylon, on the west, killed two soldiers.

## Appendix 4

### *Excerpts from Pre-Christian Greek Chronicles*

The following translations have been provided to give readers an idea of the structure and content of the surviving Greek chronicles. They can be compared with earlier Assyrian and Babylonian chronicles (Appendix 3) and with later Latin chronicles (Appendix 5). These texts are presented in chronological order and, as above, a bracketed ellipsis [...] indicates text missing in the original.

#### 1. The Parian Marble (*FgrHist*, 239)

The Parian Marble survives on two blocks of marble from the island of Paros. The original text is simply a solid block of letters with no gaps, spaces, or punctuation. The dates noted after each entry are simply the stated years plus 263 down to the archonship of Philocrates (485) and 264 from the next entry onwards (see Kokinnos 2009: 45 n. 28), and not the dates indicated by Jacoby or the actual dates of the events. We have retained the random shifts to the present tense. One peculiarity we have not retained is the basic structure of each entry, which usually begins ‘ἂφ’ οὐ’, thus, for example, ‘From the time when (X happened), 1318 years (have elapsed)’. We have adopted a more natural-sounding structure for English.

##### *Fragment A*

From all types of records and general histories I have produced a chronological record of the past beginning with Cecrops, the first king of Athens, down to the archons [...] yanax in Paros and Diognetus in Athens. (264–263 BC)

Cecrops became king of Athens and the country was called Cecropia, having previously been called Actica from Actaeus who was a native (of the area) 1318 years ago. (1) (1581–1580 BC)

Deucalion became king near Parnassus in Lycoria when Cecrops was king of Athens 1310 years ago. (2) (1573–1572 BC)

There was a trial in Athens between Ares and Poseidon over Poseidon’s son Halirrhothius and the location (of the trial) was called the Hill of Ares (Areopagus) 1268 years ago, when Cranaus was king of Athens. (3) (1531–1530 BC)

There was a flood in the time of Deucalion, and Deucalion fled the inundation from Lycoreia to Cranaus in Athens, built the temple of Olympian Zeus, and made thank offerings for his deliverance 1265 years ago, when Cranaus was king of Athens. (4) (1528–1527 BC)

Amphictyon the son of Deucalion became king in Thermopylae, assembled those who were living around the temple, named them Amphictyones, and sacrificed on their behalf, on the very spot where even today the Amphictyones still sacrifice, 1258 years ago, when Amphictyon was king of Athens. (5) (1521–1520 BC)

Hellen the son of Deucalion became king of Phthiotis, those who had previously been called ‘Graeci’ were named Hellenes (Greeks), and the Panathenaean games [...] 1257 years ago, when Amphictyon was king of Athens. (6) (1520–1519 BC)

Cadmus the son of Agenor arrived in Thebes [...] and founded the Cadmea 1255 years ago, when Amphictyon was king of Athens. (7) (1518–1517 BC)

[...]nices became king 1252 years ago, when Amphictyon was king of Athens. (8) (1515–1514 BC)

The first ship with fifty oars, which had been built by Danaus, sailed from Egypt to Greece and was called a penteconter, and after [...], Helice, and Archedice, who were daughters of Danaus, had been chosen by lot by the rest (of their sisters), they built the temple of Lindian Athena [...] and sacrificed on the promontory in [...] in Lindos of Rhodes 1247 years ago, when Erichthonius was king of Athens. (9) (1510–1509 BC)

Erichthonius yoked (horses to) a chariot during the first Panathenaean Games, set forth the rules of the competition, and gave the Athenians their name; (when) a statue of the mother of the gods appeared in the Cybelian Mountains (of Phrygia) and (when) Hyagnis of Phrygia for the first time invented the Phrygian auloi in [...] and for the first time played music in what is called the Phrygian mode, and other melodies: Mother’s, Dionysus’s, Pan’s and [...], 1242 years ago, when Erichthonius, who yoked (horses to) a chariot, was king of Athens. (10) (1505–1504 BC)

The first Minos became king of Crete and settled Apollonia, and iron was discovered on (Mount) Ida by Celmis and Damnameneus of the Idaean Dactyloi 11[...] years ago, when Pandion was king of Athens. (11)

Demeter arrived in Athens and discovered wheat, and the pre-tillage festival (Proerosia) was celebrated for the first time, under the direction of Triptolemus, son of Celeus and Neaera, 1146 years ago, when Erichtheus was king in Athens. (12) (1409–1408 BC)

Triptolemus reaped the wheat that he had sown in Raria, which is called Eleusis, 1145 years ago, when Erichtheus was king of Athens. (13) (1408–1407 BC)

Orpheus publicly performed his own poem [...]: on the rape of Kore, Demeter’s search, the seed that was fashioned by her, and the multitude of those who received its fruit, 1135 years ago, when Erichtheus was king of Athens. (14) (1398–1397 BC)

Eumolpus revealed the mysteries in Eleusis [...] and publicly performed the poems of his father, Musaeus, 11[...] years ago, when Erichtheus son of Pandion was king of Athens. (15)

There was a purification for the first time [...] 1062 years ago, when Pandion son of Cecrops was king of Athens. (16) (1325–1324 BC)

In Eleusis the gymnastic contest [...] the Lycaea was celebrated in Arcadia and [...] of Lycaon were given to the Greeks [...] years ago, when Pandion son of Cecrops was king of Athens. (17)

[...] Heracles [...] years ago, when Aegeus was king in Athens. (18)

There was a shortage of crops in Athens and Apollo replied to the Athenians when they consulted his oracle that they should pay whatever penalty Minos deemed appropriate, 1031 years ago, when Aegeus was king of Athens. (19) (1294–1293 BC)

Theseus united the twelve cities into a single state after becoming king of Athens and granted them a constitution and democracy, [...] of Athens established the Isthmian games after killing Sinis 995 years ago. (20) (1258–1257 BC)

The campaign of the Amazons against Attica was 992 years ago, when Theseus was king of Athens. (21) (1255–1256 BC)

The Argives along with Adrastus made war against Thebes and established the games at Nemea on account of Archemorus 987 years ago, when Theseus was king of Athens. (22) (1250–1249 BC)

The Greeks campaigned against Troy 954 years ago, in the thirteenth year that Menestheus was king of Athens. (23) (1217–1216 BC)

Troy was captured 945 years ago, in the twenty-second year that Menestheus was king of Athens, on the seventh day before the end of the month of Thargelion (= 23 Thargelion). (24) (1208–1207 BC)

Orestes, son of Agamemnon, and Erigone, daughter of Aegisthus, were put on trial on the Areopagus for (the murder of) Aegisthus and Clytemnestra, a trial in which Orestes was acquitted because the votes were equal, 944 (?) years ago, when Demophon was king of Athens. (25) (1207–1206 BC)

Teucer colonized Salamis on Cyprus 938 years ago, when Demophon was king of Athens. (26) (1201–1200 BC)

Neleus colonized Miletus and the rest of Ionia — Ephesus, Erythrae, Clazomene, Priene, Lebedus, Teos, Colophon, Myus, Phocaea, Samos, Chios — and the Panionian Games were instituted 813 years ago, in the thirteenth year that Menestheus was king of Athens. (27) (1076–1075 BC)

Hesiod the poet appeared 68[.] years ago, when [...] was king of Athens. (28)

Homer the poet appeared 643 years ago, when Diognetus was king of Athens. (29) (906–905 BC)

Phidon the Argive, who was eleventh (in descent) from Heracles, made his measures public, established weights, and minted a silver coinage in Aegina 631 years ago, when Pherecles was king of Athens. (30) (894–893 BC)

Archias son of Evaetus, who was tenth (in descent) from Temenus, led a colony from Corinth and founded Syracuse, [...] years ago, in the twenty-first year that Aeschylus was king of Athens. (31)

The annual archonship began 420 years ago. (32) (683–682 BC)

[...] 418 years ago, when Lysiades was archon in Athens. (33) (681–680 BC)

Terpander of Lesbos, son of Derdeneus, revolutionized musical rhythms for the cithara [...] and changed the existing style of music 381 years ago, when Dropides was archon in Athens. (34) (644–643 BC)

Allyattes became king of the Lydians 341 years ago, when Aristocles was archon in Athens. (35) (604–603 BC)

Sappho sailed from Mytilene to Sicily in flight from [...] years ago, when the first Critias was archon in Athens and in Syracuse the wealthy landowners held power. (36) (602/594 BC)

The Amphictyones offered sacrifices following the final defeat of Cyrrha and the gymnastic contest was instituted with cash prizes from the spoils 327 years ago, when Simon was archon in Athens. (37) (590–589 BC)

The competition with wreath prizes was reinstituted in Delphi 318 years ago, when the second Damasias was archon in Athens. (38) (581–580 BC)

The institution in Athens of a chorus of comic singers, which the Icarians were the first to stage and Susarion invented, and the institution of a prize for the first time — a basket of dried figs and forty litres of wine — were 2[.] years ago, when [...] was archon in Athens. (39)

Pisistratus became tyrant of Athens 297 years ago, when Comeas was archon in Athens. (40) (560–559 BC)

Croesus sent envoys from Asia to Delphi to consult the oracle 292 years ago, when Euthydemus was archon in Athens. (41) (555–554 BC)

Cyrus king of the Persians captured Sardis and Croesus [...] [...] years ago, when [...] was archon in Athens and the iambic poet Hipponax also lived about this time. (42)

The poet Thespis was the first to introduce the actor in a theatrical performance in the city and the goat was established as a prize 2[73] years ago, when the first [Phry]naeus was archon in Athens. (43) (536–535 BC)

Darius became king of the Persians after the death of (the) magus 256 years ago, when [...] was archon at Athens. (44) (519–518 BC)

Harmodius and Aristogiton killed Hipparchus the successor of Pisistratus and the Athenians expelled the Pisistratids from the Pelasgian wall 248 years ago, when Harpactides was archon in Athens. (45) (511–510 BC)

Choruses of men first competed, in which contest Hypodicus the Chalcidian was both producer and victor, 246 years ago, when Lysagoras was archon at Athens. (46) (509–508 BC)

Melanippides of Melos won the prize in Athens 231 years ago, when Pythocritus was archon in Athens. (47) (494–495 BC)

The Athenians fought the battle of Marathon against the Persians, Artaphernes the nephew of Darius, and Datis the general, which the Athenians won, 227 years ago, when the second Phaenippides was archon in Athens. Aeschylus the poet fought in this battle when he was thirty-five. (48) (490–489 BC)

Simonides, the grandfather of Simonides the poet, who was himself also a poet, won the prize in Athens, Darius dies, and Xerxes his son becomes king 226 years ago, when Aristides was archon in Athens. (49) (489–488 BC)

Aeschylus the poet first won the prize for tragedy, Euripides the poet was born, and Stesichorus the poet arrived in Greece 222 years ago, when Philocrates was archon in Athens. (50) (485–484 BC)

Xerxes lashed together his pontoon bridge on the Hellespont and dug through (Mount) Athos, and the battle of Thermopylae took place, as well as a naval battle which the Greeks fought against the Persians around Salamis and won 217 years ago, when Calliades was archon in Athens. (51) (481–480 BC)

The Athenians fought the battle of Plataea against Xerxes' general, Mardonius, which the Athenians won; Mardonius died in the battle; and fire flowed in Sicily around Etna 216 years ago, when Xanthippus was archon in Athens. (52) (480–479 BC)

Gelon the son of Dinomenes became tyrant of Syracuse 215 years ago, when Timosthenes was archon in Athens. (53) (479–478 BC)

Simonides of Kos, the son of Leoprotes and the inventor of the art of mnemonics, won the prize in Athens as a producer and the statues of Harmodius and Aristogiton were erected 213 years ago, when Adimantus was archon in Athens. (54) (477–476 BC)

Hiero became tyrant of Syracuse 208 years ago, when Chares was archon in Athens. Epicharmus the poet also lived around this time. (55) (472–471 BC)

Sophocles of Colonus, the son of Sophillus, won the prize for tragedy when he was twenty-eight 206 years ago, when Apsephion was archon in Athens. (56) (470–469 BC)

The stone fell in Aegospotami and Simonides the poet died at the age of ninety 205 years ago, when Theagenides was archon in Athens. (57) (469–468 BC)

Alexander died and his son Perdiccas becomes king of the Macedonians 199 years ago, when Euthippus was archon in Athens. (58) (463–462 BC)

Aeschylus the poet died in Gela in Sicily, having lived for sixty-nine years, 193 years ago, when the first Calles was archon in Athens. (59) (457–456 BC)

Euripides first won the prize for tragedy, when he was forty-four, 179 years ago, when Diphilus was archon in Athens. Socrates and Anaxagoras were contemporaries of Euripides. (60) (443–442 BC)

Archelaus becomes king of the Macedonians after the death of Perdiccas 157 years ago, when Astyphilus was archon in Athens. (61) (421–420 BC)

Dionysius became tyrant of Syracuse 147 years ago, when Euctemon was archon in Athens. (62) (411–410 BC)

Euripides died at the age of seventy-five (?) 145 years ago, when Antigones was archon in Athens. (63) (409–408 BC)

Sophocles the poet died at the age of ninety-two and Cyrus went up (into Persia) 143 years ago, when the first Callias was archon in Athens. (64) (407–406 BC)

Telestes of Selinus won the prize in Athens 139 years ago, when Micon was archon in Athens. (65) (403–402 BC)

The Greeks who had gone up (into Persia) with Cyrus came back and Socrates the philosopher died at the age of seventy 137 years ago, when Laches was archon in Athens. (66) (401–400 BC)

Aristonous [...] won the prize in Athens 135 years ago, when Aristocrates was archon at Athens. (67) (399–398 BC)

Polyidus of Selymbria won the prize for dithyramb at Athens 1[...] years ago, when [...] was archon in Athens. (68)

Philoxenus the dithyrambic poet dies at the age of fifty-five 116 years ago, when Pytheas was archon in Athens. (69) (380–379 BC)

Anaxandrides the comic poet won the prize in Athens 113 years ago, when Calles was archon in Athens. (70) (377–376 BC)

Astydamas won the prize in Athens 109 years ago, when Asteius was archon at Athens. The temple in Delphi burned down at this time as well. (71) (373–372 BC)

The battle of Leuctra took place between the Thebans and the Lacedaemonians, which the Thebans won, 107 years ago, when Phrasicleides was archon in Athens. Amyntas dies and Alexander his son becomes king of the Macedonians. (72) (371–370 BC)

The second Stesichorus of Himera won the prize in Athens and Megalopolis in Arcadia was founded 10[...] years ago, when [...] was archon in Athens. (73)

Dionysius of Sicily died, his son Dionysius became tyrant, and Ptolemy of Alorus becomes the king of the Macedonians following Alexander's death 104 years ago, when Nausigenes was archon in Athens. (74) (368–367 BC)

The Phocians seized the oracle in Delphi [...] 102 years ago, when Cephisodorus was archon in Athens. (75) (366–365 BC)



Timotheus died at the age of ninety [...] years ago, when [...] was archon in Athens. (76)

Philip son of Amyntas becomes the king of the Macedonians, Artaxerxes died, and his son Ochus becomes king [...] years ago, when [...] was archon in Athens. (77)

[...] won the prize in Athens ninety-three years ago, when Agathocles was archon in Athens. (78) (357–356 BC)

[...] happened ninety-one years ago, when Callistratus was archon in Athens. [...] (79) (355–354 BC)

[...] [...] years ago, when [...] was archon in Athens. (80)

### *Fragment B*

[...] Philip died and Alexander becomes king seventy-two years ago, when Pythodelus was archon in Athens. (1) (336–335 BC)

Alexander campaigned against the Triballians and Illyrians, and he came back after the Thebans had revolted and besieged his garrison, took the city by force, and razed it to the ground seventy-one years ago, when Evaenetus was archon in Athens. (2) (335–334 BC)

Alexander's crossing into Asia, his battle at the Granicus, and his battle against Darius at Issus were seventy years ago, when Ctesicles was archon in Athens. (3) (334–333 BC)

Alexander takes control of Phoenicia, Cyprus, and Egypt sixty-nine years ago, when Nicocrates was archon in Athens. (4) (333–332 BC)

Alexander's battle against Darius at Arbela (took place), which Alexander won, Babylon was captured, he dismissed his allies, and Alexandria was founded sixty-eight years ago, when Nicetes was archon in Athens. (5) (332–331 BC)

Callippus set forth his (seventy-six-year) astronomical cycle and Alexander captured Darius and hanged Bessus sixty-six years ago, when Aristophon was archon in Athens. (6) (330–329 BC)

Philemon the comic poet won the prize sixty-four years ago, when Euthycritus was archon in Athens. A Greek city was founded on the Tanaïs (River). (7) (328–327 BC)

The death of Alexander and Ptolemy's taking control of Egypt were sixty years ago, when Hegesias was archon in Athens. (8) (324–323 BC)

The war that the Athenians fought against Antipater near Lamia and the naval battle that the Macedonians fought against the Athenians off Amorgos, which the Macedonians won, were fifty-nine years ago, when Cephisodorus was archon in Athens. (9) (323–322 BC)

Antipater captured Athens and Ophelas captured Cyrene, having been sent by Ptolemy, fifty-eight years ago, when Philocles was archon in Athens. (10)  
(322–321 BC)

Antigonus crossed into Asia, Alexander was buried in Memphis, Perdicas campaigned against Egypt and died, and Craterus and Aristotle the sophist died at the age of fifty fifty-seven years ago, when Archippus was archon in Athens. Ptolemy launched an expedition to Cyrene as well. (11)  
(321–320 BC)

The death of Antipater and Cassander's withdrawal from Macedonia (took place) as well as the siege of Cyzicus that Arrhidaeus undertook, and Ptolemy captured Syria and Phoenicia fifty-five years ago, when Apollodorus was archon in Athens. In this same year as well the Syracusans chose Agathocles as commander in chief of the defences in Sicily. (12)  
(319–318 BC)

The naval battle between Clitus and Nicanor near the sanctuary of the Chalcedonians (took place) and Demetrius issued his legislation in Athens fifty-three years ago, when Demogenes was archon in Athens. (13)  
(317–316 BC)

Cassander returned to Macedonia, Thebes was (re)settled, Olympias died, Cassandrea was founded, and Agathocles became tyrant of Syracuse fifty-two years ago, when Democles was archon in Athens. Menander the comic poet won his first victory in Athens at that time as well. (14)  
(316–315 BC)

Sosiphanes the poet dies at the age of forty-five forty-nine years ago, when Theophrastus was archon at Athens. (15)  
(313–312 BC)

There was an eclipse of the sun<sup>1</sup> and Ptolemy defeated Demetrius at Gaza and sent Seleucus to Babylon forty-eight years ago, when Polemon was archon in Athens. (16)  
(312–311 BC)

Nicocreon died and Ptolemy takes control of the island (of Cyprus) forty-seven years ago, when Simonides was archon in Athens. (17)  
(311–310 BC)

Alexander the son of Alexander dies, as well as another (of Alexander's) sons, Heracles, (whose mother was) the daughter of Artabazus, and Agathocles crossed to Carthage [...c. 35 letters...] forty-six years ago, when Hieromnemon was archon in Athens. (18)  
(310–309 BC)

The city of Lysimachea was founded, Ophelas marched (?) to Carthage [...30–40 letters...], Ptolemy his son was born on Cos, and Cleopatra died in Sardis [...c. 35 letters...] forty-five years ago, when Demetrius was archon in Athens. (19)  
(309–308 BC)

<sup>1</sup> This is the total eclipse of 15 August 310 BC, which passed through the modern cities of Palermo (Sicily) and Ankara (Turkey), and just north of Athens.

Demetrius the son of Antigonus besieged and captured the Piraeus [and Demetrius of Phalerum was exiled from Athens forty-four years ago,] when Caerimus was archon in Athens. (20) (308–307 BC)

Demetrius razed Munychia to the ground and captured Cyprus and [...c. 40 letters...] forty-three years ago, when Anaxicrates was archon in Athens. (21) (307–306 BC)

Sosiphanes the poet was born and [...20–25 letters...] forty-two years ago, when Coroebus was archon in Athens. (22) (306–305 BC)

The siege of Rhodes (took place) and Ptolemy succeeded to the throne forty-one years ago, when Euxenippus was archon in Athens. (23) (305–304 BC)

Earthquakes occurred in Ionia and Demetrius took Chalcis through negotiation, and [...c. 40 letters...] of Demetrius forty years ago, when Pherecles was archon in Athens. (24) (304–303 BC)

A comet appeared and Lysimachus crossed into Asia thirty-nine years ago, when Leostratus was archon in Athens. (25) (303–302 BC)

There was a truce between Cassander and Demetrius [...] Cassander [...c. 45 letters...] died thirty-eight years ago, when Nicocles was archon in Athens. (26) (302–301 BC)

[...c. 75 letters...] of Demetrius [...] march to Chalcis, and the Athenians Cassander [...c. 80 letters...] Ptolemy [...], thirty-five years ago, when Euctemon was archon at Athens. (27) (299–298 BC)

## 2. Chronicon Romanum (*IG*, XIV, no. 1297 and *FgrHist*, 252)

The Chronicon Romanum survives in two columns on a single block of stone; the top and bottom of both columns is missing. Like the Parian Marble each column is a single long block of text. As was the case with the Parian Marble, the dates noted after each entry are simply the stated years subtracted from AD 15–16 and we have not translated the repeated ‘ἂφ’ οὗ’ before each entry (‘From the time when’) and before the year in most entries (‘From this time’).

### *Column A*

Sulla launched a war against Mithridates and (Ptolemy) Soter the Pot-bellied (Physcon), recalled a second time, returned from exile to Egypt and became king 103 years ago. (1) (88–87 BC)

Marius captured Ostia, forced Octavius to come to terms, but did not abide by his agreement and killed him; and in Attica Sulla besieged Athens and forced it to surrender 102 years ago. (2) (87–86 BC)

Fimbria defeated Mithridates' army off Cyzicus, reduced Ilium by siege, but when (his army) was engaged in battle by Sulla he committed suicide; Mithridates made a treaty with Sulla; Philopator returned to Bithynia from exile for a second time and became king; and Ariobarzanes was recalled to Cappadocia 100 years ago.

(3) (85–84 BC)

Sulla defeated Norbanus near Capua, imprisoned Marius the consul in Praeneste, and killed him when he tried to escape ninety-eight years ago. (4) (83–82 BC)

Sulla became dictator ninety-seven years ago. (5) (82–81 BC)

(Ptolemy) Soter, nicknamed the Pot-bellied, died, ninety-six (years) ago. (6) (81–80 BC)

### *Column B*

[...]. (1)

Solon was archon of the Athenians and established laws for them, and Anacharsis of Scythia travelled to Athens [...] years ago. (2)

Croesus became king of the Lydians [...] years ago. (3)

The (Seven) Sages were named [...] years ago. (4)

Pisistratus became tyrant in Athens and Aesop was thrown off a cliff by the Delphians 579 years ago. (5) (564–563 BC)

Croesus became subject to Cyrus [...] years ago. (6)

Cambyses conquered Egypt and Pythagoras was captured 540 years ago. (7) (525–524 BC)

Harmodius and Aristogiton killed Hipparchus the tyrant and Darius crossed over against the Scythians after bridging the Cimmerian Bosphorus 528 years ago. (8) (513–512 BC)

Xerxes crossed over to Abydus after bridging the Hellespont and Themistocles defeated the barbarians in a naval battle 490 years ago. (9) (475–476 BC)

Socrates the philosopher, Heraclitus of Ephesus, Anaxagoras, Parmenides, and Zeno (flourished) [...] years ago. (10)

The Peloponnesian War began and Thucydides lived [...] years ago. (11)

The Galatians defeated the Romans and took Rome 401 years ago. (12) (386–385 BC)

### **3. The Leipzig Chronograph (*P.Lips.*, 590, 1228, 1229, 1231, 1232)**

This chronograph survives as four columns on five fragments of papyrus in the University Library of Leipzig. We translate here the text fragments that make the

most sense, though very little remains of the text as a whole. This translation is based on the Greek text of columns I to III.14 edited by Luppe 2010: 205–06, which is highly speculative in places. We have, however, followed the original edition in placing the dating phrases (‘μετ’ ἄλλα ἔτη x’, literally ‘after a further x years’) at the end, not the beginning, of each sentence. We also retain the singular verb in col. III.7. The remainder is based upon the original edition published by Colomo and others 2010: 8–9. As is usually the case in our translations, we generally omit the many square brackets indicating text loss through damage, in order to make it easier for the reader to understand the text.

[ ] indicate text lost to damage

< > indicate text missed by the scribe

{ } indicate a word written twice by the scribe that should be deleted

( ) indicate a supplement to the translation

### *Column I*

[...] After Europa, the daughter of Agenor and Anchoë, had been kidnapped from Phoenicia, she and her maids settled in Crete forty years later. Cadmus founded Thebes [x years later. ...]. (lines 1–6)

### *Column II*

[...] one hundred and four years later. Ion, the son of Xuthus, and his son arrived in Asia and marked out the boundaries of the land of Ionia forty-five years later. Dius, the son of Apellus, with Hesiod his son became an inhabitant of Ascrea [x] years later. The poet Homer flourished [x] years later. The Eleians consecrated the second Olympian games to Zeus [x] years later. Cyprus was colonized [x] years later. The Heraclidae returned from exile [x years later]. (lines 13–24)

### *Column III*

[...] twenty-four years later. The Pythian Games were established thirty-five years later.

A register of those who ruled in the earlier period after Deucalion’s Flood and of the number of years that (each) ruled. And those who ruled first were the Babylonian kings.

[...]de[...]us	45 years
Adanites	[47 years]
Hyrbullus	45 years
Pheo[...]chus	31 years

The kingdom of all the Babylonians lasted for 168 years. The government came to an end in Babylon. The sons welcomed into their house [...]. (lines 1–16)

[...]	
[...] the sons were and [...] in Abydos [...] Smendes ruled [for x years]	
[.]mompames	51 years
Amenophris	[x] years
Userthos	11 years
Psossammeus	[x years]
S[...]ites	1 year
Userthos	[x years]
another S[...]tes	[x years]
[.]os	[x years]
[...] his son	75 years
Userthos	24 years (...)
Sesyncheis	14 years
Socophtheis	3 years
Amendesis	11 years
Sesonches	41 <years>
Usorthos	4[x] years (lines 27–38)

#### *Column IV*

Psonsames [x] years [...]  
 [...]  
 Speaking with a human voice the lamb predicted the future of the world.

Sebenchos	23 years
another Sebenchos	13 years

The kingdom of the Egyptians lasted for {years} years. After them ruled

Medes	48 years
Psonsames	[x] 1 years
Amoses	14 years
Amenophis	9 years
Uerthos	20 <years>
Uerthos	[x] years
Sesyncheis	[x yea]rs
Syphois	[x yea]rs
Zmendas	[x yea]rs
Userthos	[x yea]rs
Psonsames	[x yea]rs

(lines 1–19)

#### 4. Oxyrhynchus Olympiad Chronicle (*POxy*, I 12 and *FgrHist*, 255)

This chronicle survives as six columns on a single piece of papyrus that dates from the first half of the third century, though the chronicle itself is certainly earlier, but by how much cannot be known. There is an alternative translation in Christesen 2007: 337–40, who also includes a translation of *POxy* XVII 2082 (pp. 335–36), which we do not translate here because of its fragmentary nature.

[In the one hundred and sixth Olympiad (356–352 BC) ...]. In the time of the second archon (?) Dio was assassinated by Dionysius the tyrant in Syracuse. In the time of the third archon the people of Tibur were defeated by the Romans and surrendered. (1)

In the one hundred and seventh Olympiad (352–348 BC) the winner of the *stadion* was Smicrinus of Tarentum, and the archons in Athens were Aristodemus, Thessalus, Apollodorus, and Callimachus. In the third year of this Olympiad in Rome plebeian censors were elected for the first time. (2)

In the one hundred and eighth Olympiad (348–344 BC) the winner of the *stadion* was Polycles of Cyrene, and the archons in Athens were Theophilus, Themistocles, Archias, and Eubolus. In the first year of this Olympiad Plato the philosopher passed away and Speusippus was his successor (as head of) the school. In the time of the second archon Philip [...]. (3)

In the one hundred and ninth Olympiad (344–340 BC) the winner of the *stadion* was Aristolycus of Athens, and the archons in Athens were Lyciscus, Pythodotus, Sosigenes, and Nicomachus. In the second year of this Olympiad Dionysius II, tyrant of Sicily, was deposed and sailed off to Corinth, where he lived as a school teacher. In the time of the fourth archon Bagoas the eunuch assassinated Ochus, the king of the Persians, and set up the youngest of his (Ochus's) sons, Arsēs, as king, while keeping all the power for himself. (4)

In the one hundred and tenth Olympiad (340–336 BC) the winner of the *stadion* was Anticles of Athens, and the archons in Athens were Theophrastus, Lysimachides, Chaerondes, and Phrynicus. In the time of the first archon the Samnites fought against the Romans. In the time of the second archon the Latins united against the Romans and attacked them. In the time of the third archon Philip the king of the Macedonians defeated the Athenians and Boeotians in the famous battle at Chaeronea, when his son Alexander fought alongside him and distinguished himself in the battle. Isocrates the orator died, around the age of ninety. [...] Bagoas the eunuch killed Arsēs the king of the Persians along with his brothers and in his place he set up as king Darius, the son of Arsames and a man of

royal blood. At that time, too, the Romans campaigned against the Latins. In the time of the fourth archon the Greek league assembled and appointed Philip as commander in chief for the war against the Persians. (5)

In the one hundred and eleventh Olympiad (336–332 BC) the winner of the *stadion* was Cleomantis of Clitor and the archons in Athens were Pythodelus, Evaenetus, Ctesicles, and Nicocrates. In the time of the first archon, Philip the king of the Macedonians was assassinated by Pausanias, one of his bodyguards, and his son Alexander succeeded him. Once he had assumed power, Alexander first of all subdued the Illyrians, the Paenionians, and the other barbarian races that had rebelled (against him). Then he took Thebes by force and razed it to the ground. In Rome the priestesses of Vesta, in spite of being virgins for life, were accused of unchastity and [...]. In the time of the second archon, Alexander the king of the Macedonians crossed to Asia and in a battle at the Granicus (River) defeated the generals of Darius king of the Persians. In the time of the third archon, the same Alexander engaged Darius at Issus in Cilicia and again defeated him, killing Persians and their allies in the tens of thousands and taking many prisoners and much booty. At that time, too, Alexander of Molossus crossed to Italy to help the Greeks who lived there. In the time of the fourth archon, the Romans made the Campanians(?) Roman citizens [...] without the vote [...]. (6)

In the one hundred and twelfth Olympiad (332–328 BC) the winner of the *stadion* was Gryllus of Chalcis and the archons in Athens were Nicetes, Aristophanes, Aristophon, and Cephisophon. In the first year of this Olympiad, Alexander the son of Phillip captured Tyre and took over Egypt, whose inhabitants welcomed him with open arms because of their hatred of the Persians. At this time as well he ordered [...]. He travelled to the (temple) of Ammon, and during this trip he founded the city of Paraetionium. In the time of the third archon, there was another battle between Alexander and Darius, this time at Arbela, which Alexander won. At this time, too, Darius was assassinated by his own friends and the Persian Empire came to an end, 233 years after its foundation by Cyrus. (7)

In the one hundred and thirteenth Olympiad (328–324 BC) the winner of the *stadion* was Criton of Macedonia and the archons in Athens were Euthycritus, Hegemon, Chremes, and Anticles. In this Olympiad for four years Alexander accomplished his other exploits in his conquest of the tribes of Asia. (8)

In the one hundred and fourteenth Olympiad (324–320 BC) the winner of the *stadion* was Micinas of Rhodes, and the archons in Athens were Hegesias, Cephisophon, Philocles, and Archippus. In the first year of this Olympiad Alexander the king passed away, having ruled for thirteen years and lived for thirty-three. In the



time of the second archon, Ptolemy the son of Lagus was sent to Egypt and ruled the country. In the [...] year [...]. (9)

In the one hundred and fifteenth Olympiad (320–316 BC) the winner of the *stadion* was Damasias of Amphipolis and the archons in Athens were Neaechmus, Apollodorus, Archippus, and Demogenes. In the time of the first archon, Antipater, who had succeeded to the kingdom of Macedonia, engaged the Greeks at Lamia and defeated them. The Romans engaged the Samnites and were defeated. In the time of the second archon, Antipater crossed to Asia against Perdiccas and made the second partition (of the empire) among Alexander's successors, in which Ptolemy again participated. In the time of the third archon, the Romans engaged the Samnites and were victorious, recovering those of their men who had been taken prisoner in the previous battle. (10)

In the one hundred and sixteenth Olympiad (316–312 BC) the winner of the *stadion* was Demosthenes of Laconia and the archons in Athens were Democles, Praxibulus, Nicodorus, and Theodorus. In the time of the first archon, Antipater died and Polyperchon succeeded to the government [...]. (11)

## 5. Phlegon of Tralles, *Collection of Olympic Victors and Chronicles* (Photius, *Bibliotheca*, cod. 97 = *FgrHist*, 257 F 12)

This chronicle survives only as a quotation in the work of the Byzantine bibliophile Photius. There is also a translation in Hansen 1996: 61–62 and Christesen 2007: 329–30.

In the one hundred and seventy-seventh Olympiad (72–68 BC) the victors were: Hecatomnus of Miletus, three victories: *stadion*, *diaulos* (double course), and race in armour; (1) Hypsicles of Sicyon, *dolichos* (the long course); Gaius of Rome, *dolichos*; Aristonymidas of Cos, pentathlon; Isidore of Alexandria, wrestling, undefeated during (all the great public games of this four-year) period; Atyanas, the son of Hippocrates, of Adramyttion, boxing; Sphodrias of Sicyon, *pankration*; Sosigenes of Asia, boys' *stadion*; Apollophanes of Cyparissae, boys' wrestling; Soterichus of Elis, boys' boxing; Calas of Elis, boys' *pankration*; Hecatomnus of Miletus, *hoplites* (race in armour), who was crowned three times at these games, for *stadion*, *diaulos*, and *hoplites*; the four-horse chariot of Aristolochus of Elis; the riding horse of Hegemon of Elis; the two-horse chariot of Hellanicus of Elis; the four-colt chariot of the same man; the two-colt chariot of Cletias of Elis; and the riding colt of Callippus of Elis. (2)

Lucullus continued his siege of Amisus. Having left Murena in charge of the siege with two legions he himself advanced with three others to Cabeira, where he passed the winter. He sent orders to Hadrian to attack Mithridates and was victorious in the ensuing battle. (3) There was an earthquake in Rome and many of its buildings collapsed. (4) [Photius notes that he has edited out material here.] (5)

In the third year of this Olympiad (70–69 BC) 910,000 Romans were counted in the census. (6) And Phraates, nicknamed The God, succeeded Sinatruces, the king of the Parthians, when he died. (7) Patron succeeded Phaedrus the Epicurean. (8) Vergilius Maro the poet was born in this year on 15 October. (9)

In the fourth year (69–68 BC) having assembled 40,000 infantry and 30,000 cavalry and drawn them up in Italian formation, Tigranes and Mithridates attacked Lucullus. Lucullus was victorious. Five thousand of Tigranes' men were killed and even more of them were taken prisoner, not counting another large group of other people. (10) Catulus dedicated the Capitolium in Rome. (11) Metellus set out for the war in Crete with three legions. Having arrived on the island he defeated Lasthenes and was proclaimed *imperator*. He also besieged the Cretans. (12) The pirate Athenodorus enslaved the Delians and committed outrages against the statues of their so-called gods, but C. Triarius repaired the city's damages and fortified Delos with a wall. (13)

## Appendix 5

### *Excerpts from Roman Consularia and Chronicles*

#### 1. Consularia

##### *1.1. Fasti Ostienses*

In the following translation, the annual notices of suffect consuls and local officials have been omitted for the sake of clarity.

Sex. Pompeius, Sex. Appuleius (14)

Augustus for the third time and Tiberius Caesar conducted a census.

4,100,937 Roman citizens were enumerated. Augustus died on 19 August.

Drusus Caesar, son of Tiberius; C. Norbanus (15)

Sisenna Statilius Taurus, L. Scribonius Libo (16)

[...] was presented to the people.

L. Pomponius Flaccus, C. Caelius (17)

On 26 May Germanicus Caesar celebrated a triumph (for a victory) in Germania.

Ti. Caesar III, Germanicus Caesar II (18)

M. Junius Silanus, L. Norbanus Balbus (19)

Cessation of business on 8 Dec. because of the death of Germanicus.

M. Valerius Messalla, M. Aurelius Cotta (20)

On 28 May Drusus Caesar celebrated a triumph (for a victory) in Illyricum.

On 7 June Nero put on his adult toga; largesse was distributed.

Ti. Caesar IV, Drusus Caesar II (21)

(text missing)

C. Fufius Geminus, L. Rubellius Geminus (29)

M. Vinicius, L. Cassius Longinus (30)

On 12 March the arch of Drusus was dedicated.

On 28 April, in the place of Duovir (P. Paetinius) Dexter, A. Egrilius Rufus was made pontifex of Vulcan and A. Hostilius Gratus was proclaimed duovir.

Ti. Caesar Augustus V (31)

On 18 Oct. Sejanus was strangled.

On 24 Oct. Strabo, Sejanus's son, was strangled. On 26 Oct. Apicata, Sejanus's wife, committed suicide. On <14 Nov.–13> Dec. (the bodies of) Capito Aelianus and Junilla, Sejanus's daughter, lay exposed on the Gemonian Steps.

Camillus Arruntius, Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus (32)

L. Livius Ocella Sulpicius Galba, L. Cornelius Sulla (33)

On <16 July–13> Aug. Sejanus's conspiracy was extinguished and many (bodies) lay exposed on the Gemonian Steps.

Paullus Fabius Persicus, L. Vitellius (34)

C. Cestius, M. Servilius Nonianus (35)

Sex. Papinius Allenius, Q. Plautius (36)

On 1 November the part of the Circus Maximus along the basketmakers' shops burned down, for which Tiberius Caesar publicly donated 100,000,000 sesterces.

In the place of A. Egrilius Rufus, M. Naevius Optatus was made pontifex of Vulcan on 17 July.

Cn. Acerronius, C. Pontius (37)

On 16 March Tiberius Caesar died at Misenum. On 29 March his body was carried into the city by soldiers.

On 3 April he was given a state funeral. On 1 May Antonia died.

On 1 June largesse of seventy-five denarii was distributed.

On 19 July a further seventy-five denarii (was distributed).

M. Aquila Julianus, P. Nonius Asprenas (38)

On 10 June Drusilla died.

On 21 Oct. the Aemilian quarter (of Rome) burned down.

## 1.2. Descriptio consulum, *Early Excerpts*

Note: years without entries have been omitted and consular names have not been corrected.

Brutus and Peo (112 BC)

In this consulship, the beginning of the Jugurthine War.

Serranus and Caepio (106 BC)

In this consulship Cicero was born on 24 April.

Marius VII and Cinna II (86 BC)

In this consulship Sallust was born on 1 October.

Hortensius and Metellus (69 BC)

In this consulship Vergil was born on 15 October.

Cicero and Antoninus (63 BC)

In this consulship the war of Catiline was fought.

Pansa and Hirtius (43 BC)

In this consulship Cicero died on 28 April.

- Lepidus and Planus (42 BC)
- Antoninus Pietas and Isauricus (41 BC)
- In this consulship the Isaurian War was fought. (1)
- And Julius Caesar, tricked by a decree of the senate, is killed in the senate house by Cassius and Brutus. (2)
- After him Octavian Caesar was named Augustus. (3)
- Calbinus II and Pollinio (40 BC)
- Rufus Censorinus and Sabinus (39 BC)
- Pulcer and Flaccus (38 BC)
- In this consulship Sallust died on 13 May.
- Agrippa and Gallus (37 BC)
- Publicola and Herva Cocceius (36 BC)
- Cornificius and Pompey the Great (35 BC)
- In this consulship the war of the runaway slaves was fought.
- Antoninus II and Libo (34 BC)
- In this consulship Cicero died, having been killed on 28 April.
- Octavian Augustus II and Paulus (33 BC)
- In this consulship, the first (Spanish) era. (1)
- The orbit of the moon was discovered. (2)
- Consuls. (3)
- Octavian Augustus VI and Agrippa (28 BC)
- In this consulship Carthage received its autonomy from the Roman people.
- The two Lentuli (18 BC)
- In this consulship Vergil died on 21 September.
- Octavian XIII and Silanus (2 BC)
- In this consulship Christ was born on 25 December.
- Rufus and Rubellio (29)
- In this consulship Christ suffered (death) on 23 March and rose (from the dead) on the twenty-fifth of the same month.
- Nero III and Messala Corvinus (58)
- In this consulship Peter and Paul suffered (death) on 29 June.
- Marius and Gallus (62)
- In this consulship Judaea was captured.
- Italus and Trahalus (68)
- In this consulship Nero disappeared.
- Vespasian VIII and Domitian III (77)
- In this consulship the Jews were utterly defeated.

Valens and Vetus (96)  
In this consulship Domitian died in his palace in Rome.

*1.3. Descriptio consulum, the Fourth Century*

Datianus and Cerealis (358)  
In this consulship Persian envoys entered Constantinople on 23 February.  
(1)

In the same year there was an earthquake on 24 August and as a result the city of Nicomedia was completely levelled. In fact, 150 other cities were partially damaged (as well). (2)

Eusebius and Hypatius (359)  
In this consulship Gratian, the son of Augustus Valentinian, was born on 18 April (1)  
and in the same year the first prefect of the city, Honoratus, took office in Constantinople on 11 December. (2)

Constantius X and Julian III (360)  
In this consulship the <Great> Church was dedicated in Constantinople on 16 February.

Taurus and Florentius (361)  
In this consulship Augustus Constantius died at Mopsucrenae on the border of the province of Cilicia Phoenicia on 3 November (1)  
and Augustus Julian entered Constantinople on 11 December. (2)

Mamertinus and Nevitta (362)

Augustus Julian IIII and Sallustius (363)  
In this consulship Augustus Julian was killed during the Persian war on 26 June and, since he had become an apostate from God, a persecutor of the Christians was killed as well (1)  
and the most Christian Jovian was proclaimed augustus on 27 June. (2)

Augustus Jovian and Varrus (364)  
In this consulship Augustus Jovian departed (this life) at Dadastana on 19 February (1)  
and Valentinian was proclaimed augustus at Nicaea on 26 February. (2)  
In the same year Valens was proclaimed augustus by his brother Valentinian at the tribunal seven miles from Constantinople on 29 March. (3)

Augusti Valentinian and Valens (365)  
In this consulship the sea rose above its normal levels on 21 July (1)  
and in the same year a nocturnal bandit and public enemy appeared in the city of Constantinople on 28 September. (2)

*Nobilissimus puer* Gratian and Dalaifus (366)

In this consulship Valentinian the younger, the son of Augustus Valens, was born on 18 January (1)

and in the same year the same public enemy and pirate was suppressed and put to death in the plain of Nacoleia in Phrygia Salutaris by Augustus Valens on 27 May. (2)

In the same year Augustus Valentinian completely defeated the tribe of the Alamanni. (3)

Lupicinus and Jovinus (367)

In this consulship in the city of Constantinople God rained down hailstones the size of rocks on 4 July (1)

and in the same year Gratian was proclaimed augustus in Gaul by his father Augustus Valentinian at the tribunal in Ambiani on 24 August. (2)

Valentinian II and Valens II (368)

In this consulship there was an earthquake and as a result the city of Nicaea was completely levelled on 11 October.

*Nobilissimus puer* Valentinian and Victor (369)

In this consulship a magnificent cistern in Constantinople, which he had begun during his first prefecture, was completed by Domitius Modestus *uir clarissimus* and prefect of the city for the second time. (1)

After seventeen years the *Agon* was restored by Augustus Valens. (2)

#### 1.4. *Consularia Vindobonensia Tradition (c. 530)*

Note: the figures in brackets after each entry refer to Mommsen's edition of the *Consularia Vindobonensia priora*. Where two appear, the second refers to his edition of the *Consularia Scaligeriana* (*Barbarus Scaligeri*), which ends in 387. These latter only appear when information from that text has been used in compiling the entry. Entries marked with an asterisk also appear in the *Excerpta Sangallensia*, excerpts from the same manuscript tradition that led to the *Consularia Vindobonensia priora* (see Burgess 2012).

Ausonius and Olybrius (379)

In this consulship Theodosius was proclaimed emperor by Gratian at Sir-mium on 19 January. (497/316)

Gratian II and Theodosius (380)

Syagrius and Eucherius (381)

Antoninus and Syagrius II (382)

Merobaudes II and Saturninus (383)

- In this consulship Gratian was killed by Maximus at Leudunum (= Lyon)  
on 25 August. (502/321)
- In this year Honorius was born in Constantinople on 9 September and  
Arcadius was proclaimed emperor. (503)
- Ricomar and Clearchus (384)
- Arcadius and Bauto (385)
- Nobilissimus puer* Honorius and Euodius (386)
- Valentinian for the third time and Eutropius (387)
- Theodosius II and Cynegius (388)
- In this consulship Maximus was killed on 28 August. (510)
- Timasius and Promotus (389)
- In this consulship Theodosius entered Rome with Honorius on 13 June  
and departed thence on 30 August. (512)
- Valentinian III and Neoterius\* (390)
- In this consulship a sign like a hanging column appeared in the sky for  
thirty days. (514)\*
- Tatianus and Symmachus (391)
- In this consulship Valentinian died in Vienne on 10 June. (516)
- On this day Eugenius was proclaimed emperor on 22 August. (517)
- Arcadius VII and Rufinus (392)
- Theodosius III and Abundantius\* (393)
- In this consulship there was darkness during the third hour on Sunday  
27 October. (520)\*
- And Honorius was proclaimed emperor seven miles from Constantinople  
by his father, Theodosius, on 23 January. (521)
- Arcadius III and Honorius II (394)
- In this consulship Eugenius was killed on 6 September. (522\*)
- Olybrius and Probinus (395)
- Arcadius IIII and Honorius III (396)
- In this consulship Theodosius died in Milan on 15 December. (525)
- Caesarius and Atticus (397)
- Honorius IIII and Eutychianus (398)
- In this consulship Gildo was killed on 31 July. (528)
- (399 missing)
- Flavius Stilicho and Aurelius (400)
- Vincentius and Fravitta (401)
- In this consulship Theodosius was born in Constantinople on 13 April (531)  
and Alaric entered Italy on 18 November. (532)



Arcadius V and Honorius V (402)

Theodosius and Rumoridus (403)

In this consulship Theodosius was proclaimed emperor in Constantinople on 10 January. (535)

(*Consularia Vindobonensia priora* suffers a lacuna here)

### 1.5. *Chronicon Paschale* (translation from Whitby and Whitby 1989)

Indiction 10, year 3 (of Arcadius), consulship of Caesarius and Atticus. (397)

In the time of these consuls Flaccilla *nobilissima* the younger was born, in the month Daisius, on 17 June.

Indiction 11, year 4, the fourth consulship of Honorius Augustus and that of Eutychianus. (398)

Indiction 12, year 5, sole consulship of Theodorus. (399)

In the time of these consuls Pulcheria *nobilissima* was born in the month Audynaesus, on 19 January.

#### Olympiad 295

Indiction 13, year 6, consulship of Stilicho and Aurelian. (400)

In the time of these consuls the *nobilissima* Eudoxia was elevated as Augusta in the month Audynaesus, on 9 January, and Arcadia *nobilissima* was born in the month Xanthicus, on 3 April.

And in the same year many Goths were slain in the Lemomacellium. And the church of the Goths was burnt with a great multitude of Christians, in the month Panemus, on 12 July. And Goths were engulfed in the sea at the Chersonese straits in the month Apellaeus, on 23 December.

Indiction 14, year 7, consulship of Vincentius and Flavitus. (401)

In the time of these consuls the head of Gainas the Goth was paraded, in the month of Audynaesus, on 3 January.

And in the same year Theodosius *nobilissimus* son of Arcadius Augustus was born in the month Xanthicus, on 10 April.

And in the same year the sea was frozen for twenty days like ice.

Indiction 15, year 8, the fifth consulship of Arcadius Augustus and the fifth of Honorius Augustus. (402)

In the time of these consuls Theodosius II was elevated as Augustus in Constantinople on the tribunal at the Hebdomon by Arcadius his father, in the month Audynaesus, on 10 January.

Indiction 1, year 9, consulship of Theodosius II Augustus and Rumoridus. (403)

In the time of these consuls Maria *nobilissima* was born, in the month Peritius, on 10 February.

## Olympiad 296

Indiction 2, year 10, the sixth consulship of Honorius Augustus and that of Aristaenetus (404)

In the time of these consuls John bishop of Constantinople was expelled, and the Great Church together with the Senate-house was suddenly burnt by those in possession of it, the so-called Xylocircites, on a Monday at the sixth hour. And Arsacius was created bishop at the Apostles in the month Daisius, on 26 June, a Monday.

In this year God showered hail like stones the size of nuts on Constantinople, in the month Hyperberetaeus, on a Friday at the eighth hour. And Eudoxia Augusta died in the same month Hyperberetaeus, 6 October, a Thursday, and was laid in the Holy Apostles in the month Hyperberetaeus, on 12 October, a Wednesday.

Indiction 3, year 11, the second consulship of Stilicho and that of Anthemius. (405)

Indiction 4, year 12, the sixth consulship of Arcadius Augustus and that of Probus. (406)

In the time of these consuls the gates of the Hippodrome were burnt, together with the Prandiara and the adjacent porticoes, in the month Hyperberetaeus, on 25 October, at the third hour of the night.

And in the same year the remains of St Samuel were conveyed to Constantinople by way of the Chalcedonian jetty, in the month Artemisius, on 19 May, with Arcadius Augustus leading the way, and Anthemius, praetorian prefect and former consul, Aemilianus, city prefect, and all the senate; these remains were laid to rest for a certain time in the most holy Great Church.

*1.6. Paschale Campanum (entire portion of the text that contains annotations)*

Note: Figures on the left are years from the crucifixion. The 'B' ('bissextilis') denotes leap years. The 'luna' indicates the phase of the moon.

(Olybrius and Rusticius)

In this consulship Easter: first, 12 April (464)

In the following year: Herminericus and Basilius Easter: 28 March (465)

Severus died.

Augustus Leo III 1 January, Sunday, luna 30 (466)  
Easter: 17 April, luna 17

	Pusaeus and John	Easter: 9 April, luna 20	(467)
	In this consulship Anthemius became emperor.		
	Augustus Anthemius II	Easter: 31 March, luna 22	(468)
	Marcellinus was killed in Sicily.		
	Marcian and Zeno	Easter: 12 April, luna 16	(469)
	Severus <i>vc</i> consul	Easter: 4 April, luna 19	(470)
	Augustus Leo III and Probianus	Easter: 28 March, luna 22	(471)
	Festus and Marcian	Easter: 16 April, luna 22	(472)
	Civil war between Anthemius and Ricimer. Anthemius was killed on 11 July. Olybrius was proclaimed (emperor). Ricimer died on 19 August and Olybrius on 2 October.		
	Augustus Leo V	Easter: 1 April, luna 18	(473)
	Licerius was proclaimed emperor on 3 March.		
	Augustus Leo the second	Easter: 21 April, luna 19	(474)
	The year after the consulship of Augustus Leo	Easter: 6 April, luna 15	(475)
		Latins: 13 April, luna 22	
	Licerius was deposed. Nepos was proclaimed (emperor).		
	Augustus Zeno II	Easter: <blank>	(475)
	Orestes drove out Nepos and Augustulus was proclaimed (emperor).		
450	Augustus Basiliscus II and Armatus	Easter: 28 March, luna 17	(476)
	Odoacar was proclaimed (king) on 23 August.		
	The year after the above-mentioned consuls	Easter: 17 April, luna 19	(477)
	Illus <i>vc</i> consul	Easter: 9 April, luna 21	(478)
	Theoderic entered Dyrrhachium.		
	Augustus Zeno III	Easter: 26 March, luna 17	(479)
	(480 missing)		
	Placidus <i>vc</i> consul	Easter: 5 April, luna 21	(481)
	Severinus <i>vc</i> consul	Easter: 18 April, luna 15	(482)
		Greeks: 25 April, luna 22	
	Faustus <i>vc</i> consul	Easter: 10 April, luna 18	(483)

	Venantius <i>vc</i> consul and Theoderic Huneric persecuted the orthodox.	Easter: 1 April, luna 20	(484)
	Symmachus <i>vc</i> consul	Easter: 21 April, luna 21	(485)
460	Decius <i>vc</i> consul	Easter: 6 April, luna 17	(486)
	Boethius <i>vc</i> consul	Easter: 29 March, luna 20	(487)
	Dynamius and Sifidius	Easter: 17 April, luna 20	(488)
	Probinus <i>vc</i> consul	Easter: 2 April, luna 16	(489)
	a different Faustus	Easter: 26 March, luna 19	(490)
	a different Olybrius <i>vc</i> consul	Easter: 14 April, luna 20	(491)
	Zeno died. Anastasius was proclaimed (emperor).		
	Augustus Anastasius and Rufus	Easter: 5 April, luna 22	(492)
	Albinus <i>vc</i> consul and Eusebius	Easter: 18 April, luna 16	(493)
	Stupid and over-confident men claim that the Antichrist will be born in this consulship.		
	Theodoric entered Ravenna.		
	Asterius and Praesidius	Easter: 10 April, luna 19	(494)
	Viator <i>vc</i> consul	Easter: 2 April, luna 22	(495)
470	The year after the consulship of Viator	Easter: 14 April, luna 15	(496)
	Other madmen say that the Antichrist will be born in this consulship.		
	Two years after the consulship of Viator	Easter: 6 April, luna 18	(497)
		Latins: 21 April, luna 22	
	Paulinus	Easter: 29 March, luna 21	(498)
	The year after the consulship of Paulinus	Easter: 18 April, luna 22	(499)
		Others: 11 April, luna 15	
	Two years after the consulship of Paulinus	Easter: 2 April, luna 18	(500)
	Avienus	Easter: 22 April, luna 19	(501)
		Romans: 25 March, luna 21	
	A different Avienus	Easter: 14 April, luna 22	(502)
	A synod was convoked on account of Pope Symmachus.		
	Volusianus	Easter: 30 March, luna 18	(503)
477	Cethegus	Easter: 19 April, luna 18	(504)
478	Theodorus	Easter: 11 April, luna 21	(505)
	Mount Vesuvius erupted on 9 November.		

479	Messala	Easter: 25 March, luna 17	(506)
480	Venantius	Easter: 15 April, luna 18	(507)
481 B	Basilius Venantius	Easter: 6 April, luna 20	(508)
		Others: 20 April, luna 15	
482	Anastasius Importunus	Easter: 22 March, luna 18	(509)
483	Boethius <i>vc</i> consul	Easter: 11 April, luna 16	(510)
484	Felix <i>vc</i> consul	Easter: 3 April, luna 20	(511)
		Latins: 1 April, luna 22	
485 B	The year after the consulship of Felix	Easter: 22 April, luna 21	(512)
	In this year there was a solar eclipse on		
	29 June (1)		
	and because Mount Vesuvius was erupt-		
	ing darkness covered the neighbour-		
	hood of the mountain on 8 July. (2)		
486	Probus	Easter: 7 April, luna 16	(513)
487	Senator	Easter: 30 March, luna 19	(514)
488	Florentius	Easter: 19 April, luna 20	(515)
489 B	Peter	Easter: 3 April, luna 16	(516)
490	Agapitus	Easter: 26 March, luna 18	(517)

## 2. Chronicles

### 2.1. *Eusebius*, *Chronici canones*

#### ROMANS: THE THIRTY-THIRD TO RULE WAS DIOCLETIAN, FOR TWENTY YEARS.

1		(285)
2		(286)
3	Diocletian proclaimed Maximianus Herculius his imperial partner.	(287)

#### OLYMPIAD 267

4		(288)
5		(289)
6		(290)
7		(291)

OLYMPIAD 268	Busiris and Coptus, cities of Thebaïs in Egypt,	
8	rebelled against Roman rule and were razed to the ground.	(292)

**2310** 9 Constantius and Maximianus Jovius were adopted into the imperial college as *nobilissimi caesares*. (293)

10 (294)

11 (295)

#### OLYMPIAD 269

12 Rome: the twenty-ninth bishop was Marcellinus. (296)

13 Alexandria and Egypt were led into rebellion by Achilleus, but they were unable to withstand the Roman assault, (297)

14 during which many were killed and those who had initiated the rebellion were punished. (298)

15 Jerusalem: the thirty-seventh bishop was Zabdas. (299)

#### OLYMPIAD 270

16 Veturius, a military commander, launched a minor persecution against the Christians in the army, and from that moment a persecution against all Christians smouldered. (300)

17 Jerusalem: the thirty-eighth bishop was Hermon. (301)  
Antioch: the nineteenth bishop was Tyrannus.

Alexandria: after Theonas the sixteenth bishop was Peter, who afterwards suffered a glorious martyrdom in the ninth year of the persecution.

18 There was a terrible earthquake, and most of Tyre and Sidon collapsed and a great number of people perished. (302)

**2320** 19 On Easter day in the month of Dystros in the nineteenth year of the reign of Diocletian, there was a demolition of the churches. (303)

#### Year of the persecution: 1

In the fourth year of the persecution Constantine began to reign.

#### OLYMPIAD 271

20 In the second year of the persecution Diocletian and Maximianus abdicated. 2 (304)

Galerius Maximianus made Maximinus and Severus caesars.

Constantius passed on gloriously after a reign of twelve years and his son Constantine ruled after him. 3 (305)

#### ROMANS: THE THIRTY-FOURTH TO RULE WAS CONSTANTINE.

1 Severus was killed. 4 (306)

2 Maximianus Herculus died. 5 (307)

The soldiers in Rome proclaimed Maxentius, the son of Maximianus Herculus, emperor.

**OLYMPIAD 272**

- 3 Galerius made Licinius emperor. 6 (308)  
 4 7 (309)  
 5 8 (310)  
 6 Galerius Maximianus died. 9 (311)

**OLYMPIAD 273**

- 7 Maxentius was defeated and killed by Constantine. 10 (312)  
 2330 8 Maximinus launched a persecution against the Christians and was about to be captured by Licinius when he died in Cilicia. Constantine granted freedom to all Christians. (314)  
 9 (314)  
 10 (315)

**OLYMPIAD 274**

- 11 Constantine proclaimed his son, Constantine, caesar. (316)  
 12 (317)  
 13 (318)  
 14 (319)

**OLYMPIAD 275**

- 15 Licinius persecuted the Christians who lived in the palace. (320)  
 Basileus, the bishop of Amaseia in Pontus, was granted the crown of martyrdom under Licinius.  
 16 The priest Arius was expelled from the church by Alexander. (321)  
 17 (322)  
 2340 18 (323)

**OLYMPIAD 276**

- 19 (324)  
 20 Constantine proclaimed his son, Constantius, caesar. (325)  
 Licinius was murdered.  
 The twentieth anniversary of Constantine's reign was celebrated in Nicomedia.

**Here collected are all the years to the twentieth year of Constantine:**

- From the fifteenth year of Tiberius and the coming of our Saviour 298 years  
 From the second year of Darius, the king of the Persians, at which time the Temple in Jerusalem was rebuilt 846 years  
 From the first Olympiad, at which time Isaiah and his contemporaries prophesied amongst the Hebrews 1102 years

From Solomon and the first building of the Temple in Jerusalem	1358 years
From the destruction of Troy, at which time Sampson was among the Hebrews	1508 years
From Moses and the double-formed Cecrops, the first king of the Athenians	1837 years
From Abraham and the reigns of Ninus and Semiramis	2342 years
<b>This entire canon, from Abraham to the twentieth year of Constantine, contains</b>	2342 years
From the flood to Abraham	942 years
From Adam to the flood	2242 years

**Altogether from Adam to the twentieth year of Constantine there are 5526 years**

Moreover, according to the calculation of the Hebrews there are eighty-six Jubilees, which are periods of fifty years, and these encompass 4300 years.

From this time there was much peace.

2.2. *Jerome*, *Chronici canones*

**ROMANS: THE THIRTY-THIRD TO RULE WAS DIOCLETIAN, FOR TWENTY YEARS.**

- 1 Diocletian of Dalmatia, the son of a scribe, was chosen emperor and immediately executed Aper during an address to the soldiers, while swearing that he had had nothing to do with Numerian's death. (225<sup>c</sup>) (286)
- 2 Diocletian made Herculus Maximianus co-emperor, and the latter then restored peace to Gaul by suppressing a mob of peasants who called themselves Bacaudae. (225<sup>d</sup>) (287)
- 3 (288)

**OLYMPIAD 267**

- 4 Carausius seized power and occupied Britain, Narseh waged war against the East, (225<sup>e</sup>) the Quinquegentiani repeatedly attacked Africa, (225<sup>f</sup>) and Achilles seized control of Egypt. Because of these disasters Constantius and Galerius Maximianus were given imperial power as caesars. Constantius was the grandson of Claudius on his mother's side and Galerius had been born in Dacia not far from Serdica. (289)
- 5 (290)
- 6 And in order to unite these men by family ties as well <as office>, Diocletian had Constantius marry Herculus's step-daughter, Theodora (who afterwards bore him six (291)



- 7 children who were siblings of Constantine), and had Galerius marry his daughter Valeria. Both men were forced to divorce the wives they already had. (225<sup>a</sup>) (292)

**OLYMPIAD 268**

- 8 Busiris and Coptus rebelled against the Romans and were (293)  
 2310 9 razed to the ground. (226<sup>c</sup>) (294)  
 10 The tribes of the Carpi and Basterni were relocated onto (295)  
 Roman territory. (226<sup>b</sup>)  
 11 Diocletian was the first emperor to command that he be (296)  
 revered as a god and that his clothes and shoes be studded  
 with jewels, even though all previous emperors had been  
 addressed in the same manner as provincial governors and  
 apart from a purple cloak wore only ordinary clothing. (226<sup>c</sup>)

**OLYMPIAD 269**

- 12 Roman church: Marcellianus became the twenty-eighth (297)  
 bishop. (226<sup>d</sup>)  
 13 Alexandria, which with all Egypt had been led to declare its (298)  
 independence from Roman power by the commander  
 Achilles, was captured by Diocletian after a siege of more  
 14 than seven months. As a result many people throughout all (299)  
 Egypt suffered harsh proscriptions and exile, once those  
 who had been the leaders of the rebellion had been exe-  
 cuted. (226<sup>e</sup>)  
 15 Church of Jerusalem: Zabdas was ordained the thirty-seventh (300)  
 bishop. (226<sup>f</sup>)  
 After ten years Britain was recaptured by Asclepiodotus, the  
 praetorian prefect. (227<sup>a</sup>)

**OLYMPIAD 270**

- Sixty thousand Alamanni were slaughtered by Caesar  
 Constantius near Lingonae. (227<sup>b</sup>)  
 16 After his defeat at the hands of Narseh, Galerius Maximianus (301)  
 ran in front of Diocletian's chariot in full imperial regalia.  
 (227<sup>c</sup>)  
 Tenth A military commander named Veturius persecuted his Chris-  
 persecution tian soldiers and gradually from that time a persecution  
 (227<sup>c</sup>) arose against us. (227<sup>d</sup>)  
 17 After he had defeated Narseh and captured his wives, (302)  
 children, and sisters, Galerius Maximianus was received  
 with signal honour by Diocletian. (227<sup>e</sup>)

	The Baths of Diocletian in Rome and those of Maximian in Carthage were built. (227 <sup>g</sup> )	
18	Church of Jerusalem: Hermon was the thirty-eighth in charge. (227 <sup>h</sup> )	(303)
	Antioch: Tyrannus was appointed the nineteenth bishop. (227 <sup>i</sup> )	
2320	19 Alexandrian church: after Theonas Peter was ordained the sixteenth bishop. Afterwards, in the ninth year of the persecution, he achieved a glorious martyrdom. (227 <sup>k</sup> )	(304)
A Jubilee according to our forebears	Augusti Diocletian and Maximian celebrated a triumph in Rome with a remarkable procession in which Narseh's wife, sisters, and children, and all the spoils that they had looted from the Parthians were paraded before their chariot. (227 <sup>m</sup> )	
	There was a terrible earthquake in Tyre and Sidon that destroyed many buildings and buried innumerable people. (228 <sup>n</sup> )	
	During Easter in March of the nineteenth year of Diocletian the churches were demolished. However, in the fourth year of the persecution Constantine began to reign. (228 <sup>b</sup> )	
Year 351 of Antioch	Of the persecution, <year>	1
(228 <sup>c</sup> )	<b>OLYMPIAD 271</b>	
20	In the second year of the persecution Diocletian abdicated in Nicomedia, Maximian in Milan. (228 <sup>d</sup> )	2 (305)
	Rome: Eusebius was appointed the twenty-ninth bishop for seven months, and after him Miltiades, the thirtieth, led the church for four years. (228 <sup>e</sup> )	
	Maximinus and Severus were made caesars by Galerius Maximianus. (228 <sup>f</sup> )	3 (306)
	In the sixteenth year of his reign Constantius died at Eboracum in Britain, and after him Constantine, his son by his concubine Helena, usurped power. (228 <sup>g</sup> )	

2.3. Prosper (*Text of 445 edition*)

	Theodosius XII and Augustus Valentinian II	(426)
	Patroclus, bishop of Arelas, was cut to pieces with many wounds and then killed by a tribune named Barnabas. This crime was traced back to the secret directive of Felix, the <i>magister militum</i> , at whose	

instigation Titus, a deacon and holy man, was also believed to have been killed while distributing money to the poor in Rome. (1292)

**400 Hierius and Ardabur** (427)

Boniface, whose power and reputation within Africa were growing, refused to return to Italy, and as a result, on the authority of Felix, a war was officially undertaken against him under the command of Mavortius, Galbio, and Sanoex. Mavortius and Galbio were betrayed by Sanoex and slain while they were besieging Boniface, and soon he himself was treacherously exposed and killed by Boniface. Consequently, the tribes who did not know how to use ships were summoned by the combatants as reinforcements and the sea was thus made accessible to them. The command of the war begun against Boniface was then transferred to *Comes* Sigisvult. (1294)

The tribe of the Vandals crossed from Spain to Africa. (1295)

**Felix and Taurus** (428)

Nestorius, the bishop of Constantinople, tried to introduce a new error into the churches, preaching that Christ was born of Mary only a man, not God, and that his divinity was conferred upon him according to his merit. This impiety was resisted by the outstanding diligence of Cyril, the bishop of Alexandria, and the authority of Pope Celestine. (1297)

The part of Gaul near the Rhine that the Franks had occupied in order to possess it was regained by the arms of *Comes* Aëtius. (1298)

**Florentius and Dionysius** (429)

After Felix had been promoted to the rank of *patricius*, Aëtius was made *magister militum*. (1300)

Agricola the Pelagian, son of the Pelagian bishop Severianus, corrupted the churches of Britain by the surreptitious introduction of his doctrine. But in response to the accusation of the deacon Palladius, Pope Celestine sent Germanus, the bishop of Autisidora, as his representative and when he had defeated the heretics he guided the Britons to the orthodox faith. (1301)

**Theodosius XIII and Valentinian III** (430)

Since Aëtius had had a premonition that Felix, Felix's wife Padusia, and the deacon Grunitus were plotting against him, he killed them. (1303)

Augustine, a most distinguished bishop in everything, died on 28 August. During his very last days, amidst the attacks of the

besieging Vandals, he was replying to the books of Julian and persevering gloriously in the defence of Christian grace. (1304)

Bassus and Antiochus (431)

At a synod of more than 200 clergy held at Ephesus, Nestorius was condemned along with the heresy that bears his name and many Pelagians, who espoused a kindred doctrine. (1306)

Palladius was ordained by Pope Celestine and was sent as their first bishop to the Irish who believed in Christ. (1307)

#### 2.4. *Hydatius*

ROMANS: SEVERUS, THE FORTY-FIFTH, WAS PROCLAIMED *AUGUSTUS* BY THE SENATE OF ROME IN THE FIFTH YEAR OF THE REIGN OF LEO. (206)

1 Suniericus returned to Gaul. (207) (462)

On the orders of Theoderic Nepotianus accepted Arborius as his successor. (208)

In the province of Gallaecia various portentous manifestations were seen.

In the 500th <year of the Spanish> ERA on 2 March the cocks crowed at sunset and the full moon turned to blood. That day was a Friday. (209)

Greater Antioch of Isauria, paying no heed to the warnings for its salvation, was swallowed up when the earth split open, and all that remained above the ground was the tops of the towers. Only the bishop of this city was saved from death, along with a number of people who followed him in obedience to the fear of the Lord. (210)

Gaiseric sent Valentinian's widow back to Constantinople. His daughters were joined in bonds of matrimony, one to Gento, a son of Gaiseric, the other to Olybrius, a senator from the city of Rome. (211)

OLYMPIAD 311 Agrippinus, a Gallic *comes* and citizen, and enemy of the distinguished *comes* Aegidius, betrayed Narbona to Theoderic in order to win the assistance of the Goths. (212)

In Gallaecia in June, lightning set fire to villas and burned flocks of sheep.

Pieces of flesh fell from heaven mixed with rain. Two young men who were fastened and attached to one another by their flesh died. (213a) /

In the *conventus* of Bracara, a portent involving two babies was seen; likewise one of four was reported at Legio. (213b)

2 In the province of Armorica, Frederic, the brother of King Theoderic, (463) rose up against Aegidius, the *comes utriusque militiae*, a man who both enjoyed an excellent reputation and was very pleasing to God because

of his good works. But Frederic was defeated along with his followers and killed. (214)

On his way to Gallaecia as an envoy with Palogorius, a noble of Gallaecia who had <earlier> gone to the above-mentioned king <Theoderic>, Cyrila met envoys of Rechimund who were going to Theoderic. Returning quickly <from Theoderic>, they received Cyrila in the city of Lucus on his way back <from meeting Rechimund>. Soon, after Cyrila's departure from Gallaecia, the Sueves, treacherous and characteristically false to their promises, pillaged different parts of unhappy Gallaecia in their usual manner. (215)

Remismund and Cyrila were sent back to the Sueves by Theoderic, along with a number of Goths who had previously gone <to Gallaecia>. Though Cyrila remained in Gallaecia, Remismund soon hastened back to the king and lawless disorder dominated relations between the Gallaecians and the Sueves. (216)

Roman church: the forty-third bishop to preside as bishop was Hilarus. (217)

### 3 Nepotianus departed from his body. (218) (464–65)

Upon the death of Frumarius, Remismund, by his right as king, brought all the Sueves back under his sovereignty and restored the peace that had lapsed. (219)

Envoys of the above-mentioned Aegidius crossed to the Vandals via Ocean in May and returned home by the same route in September. (220)

On Monday 20 July from the third hour to the sixth, the sun was perceived to be diminished in its light to the appearance of the moon on the fifth day. (221)

## Appendix 6

### *The Newly Published Leipzig Chronograph*

In 2010 the remains of what has been described as ‘die älteste christliche Weltchronik’ were published in the journal *Archiv für Papyrusforschung*.<sup>1</sup> It is called by its editors ‘Die Leipziger Weltchronik’ (the Leipzig World Chronicle) and consists of portions of four columns of text from a papyrus roll, now preserved on five small papyrus fragments (*P.Lips.*, 590, 1228, 1229, 1231, 1232). After their purchase in 1913 the fragments remained unpublished for almost one hundred years in the papyrus collection of the University Library in Leipzig. The first English translation of this work appears above as Appendix 4.3.

As the reader will immediately see from that translation, there is no obvious indication that the text is either Christian or a chronicle. Indeed, it quite simply can be neither Christian nor a chronicle. First of all, the little that is extant has no Christian content whatsoever. On the contrary, what survives is Greek, and Hellenistic. Europa and the settlement of Crete, Cadmus and the foundation of Thebes, Ion and the establishment of Ionia, Hesiod, Homer, the foundation of the Olympian and Pythian games, the return of the Heraclidae, the flood of Deucalion, and lists of Babylonian and Egyptian kings as the first kings of the Mediterranean after the flood of Deucalion are the sort of things that form the standard content of Hellenistic works on chronology. They are a clear legacy of the Hellenistic cultural apologetic that we examined in Chapter 3, and exactly parallel to the legendary prehistory that we find recorded on the Parian Marble, translated above (Appendix 4.1).

In fact, the content is actively non-Christian. There is no reference to Old Testament figures or chronology. Worse, the reference to Deucalion’s flood, rather than Noah’s, as the earliest event in human history, after which the Babylonians were the first kings, is decisive on its own. Writing in 221 Julius Africanus dated Deucalion’s flood to the equivalent of 1531 BC, 265 years after Moses’s exodus from Egypt. Noah’s flood was over seventeen hundred years before that, in 3241 BC.<sup>2</sup> In 325 Eusebius dated Deucalion’s flood to the equivalent of 1526 BC at a

<sup>1</sup> See Colomo and others 2010 (*editio princeps*), Luppe 2010 (corrections and supplements), Popko and Rucker 2011 (analysis of the Egyptian king list), and especially Weiß 2010 (defending the hypothesis that this is the earliest Christian world chronicle).

<sup>2</sup> Africanus, *Chron.*, T 55 (p. 165), with the pull-out chronological chart at the end of the book. There is a typographical error in the note for T 55: the sum should be 265 not 267.

time when there were kings of the Assyrians, Hebrews, Sicyonians, Argives, Athenians, Babylonians, and Egyptians. He says it happened only in Thessaly (*Chron. can.*, 42°). His date for Noah's flood is 2958 BC, just over fourteen hundred years earlier. Deucalion's flood was thus a minor event for Christian chronographers, who described two or three 'pagan' floods (including one earlier than Deucalion's under Ogygus, king of Attica) and considered Noah's to be the only true deluge. And while Africanus and Eusebius disagreed over the date of Noah's flood, long Hellenistic tradition had fixed the date of Deucalion's: the Parian Marble dates it to the equivalent of 1528 BC.

Just as important, the early date of the actual papyrus, somewhere between c. 100 and 150, likewise rules out the possibility of the text's being a Christian chronicle or work of chronology. As we saw in Chapter 3 Christian chronicles did not exist before Eusebius at the beginning of the fourth century, and large-scale chronological works, like those of Africanus and the author of the *Συναγωγή χρόνων*/*Liber generationis*, are a product of the first half of the third century. Before that we have evidence for nothing apart from a small-scale use of chronology, beginning about 150, and even that is confined very strictly to larger apologetic arguments, very specific in content and method because they derive directly from Jewish and other Hellenistic chronological apologetic. Given the development of Christian chronography from its early apologetic roots in the middle of the second century, it is simply impossible that a stand-alone work of chronology could have been Christian in the first half of the second century.

As far as we can see, the only reason to assert that this typically Hellenistic work is Christian is the fact that later Christians wrote chronicles, a mildly bizarre *ante quod, propter quod* sort of argumentation. But as this volume has shown, Christian chronicles evolved from a long tradition of pagan Hellenistic chronicles; they were not an invention of the Christians. A chronicle is not Christian simply by virtue of its being a chronicle. And that is the only evidence presented by Weiß, as is neatly summarized in his English abstract:

The genre of world chronicle is known to be a specific Christian literary genre. The text covers the same broad geographical range that we know only from Christian world chronicles. The dating of the papyrus fits in with the emerging chronographic interest of Christian apologists. And we know of Christian chronographers before Iulius Africanus, who has, perhaps wrongly, been termed the 'father of Christian chronography'. (Weiß 2010: 26)

We may now move to the question of what sort of text the Leipzig papyrus actually contains. Obviously it is not a chronicle by our definition since it does not include any relative chronology or any annalistic structure and it contains regnal lists. It simply lists a selection of important events in Greek history and notes the

time difference between succeeding events. The Leipzig papyrus is therefore exactly like the texts we refer to as chronographs, which is to say works that compile chronological notes and regnal lists, like the *Liber generationis* and the *Χρονογραφεῖον σύντομον*. The Leipzig papyrus fits into this genre quite easily. A collection of regnal lists, prefaced with a selection of important events in early Greek mythology/history, it should be called the Leipzig Chronograph, and we have referred to it as such throughout this volume.

The Leipzig Chronograph does have one interesting feature that it is worth underscoring here. When indicating the difference in years between succeeding events, the text's author used a chronological system that is unique among surviving or attested chronological works, which offer either a system of counting from an event in the past (such as the Trojan War or the first Olympiad) or count backwards from their present. The system employed in the Leipzig Chronograph is much cruder than that and offers its reader no easy means of determining a chronology either from its time of composition or from one event to any other event not immediately adjacent to it.

In terms of content, the Leipzig Chronograph contains a 'narrative' account of early Greek history that is quite surprising. This section, from Europa to the Pythian games, covers six lines at the bottom of column I, all of column II (thirty-eight lines), and two lines at the top of column III, for a total of forty-six lines. The narrowness of the lines (between 8.0 and 8.5 cm) means that most entries fill at least two or three lines and a few are even longer. Originally there cannot have been many more than about twenty separate entries and possibly even fewer. The Parian Marble covers approximately the same period in thirty-two entries extending over forty-two very long lines of text (each just under 69 cm in width): the foundation of Thebes by Cadmus (§ 7) to the Pythian games (§ 38) are dated to the equivalent of our 1518 and 581 BC and thus extend over almost 950 years. So what survives of the original text of the Leipzig papyrus is *extremely* short even by comparison to a work as short as the Parian Marble. The same time period was covered by Eusebius in his *Chronici canones* in fifty-five double pages (pp. 47–101 in Jerome's translation) and by Africanus in four of his five books.

The Parian Marble begins after a short preface with Cecrops in the equivalent of 1581 BC and reaches Cadmus in six entries and twelve lines. Six entries and an introduction might just take the Leipzig Chronograph back to the top of column I, but probably not even that far.

We can probably assume that the regnal lists of the Leipzig Chronograph continued on beyond the Egyptians to include all the other major Mediterranean kingdoms. Eusebius, relying on Hellenistic (not Christian) chronicles and histories,



provided regnal lists for eighteen kingdoms: Assyrians, Hebrews, Sicyonians, Egyptians, Argives, Athenians, Mycenaean, Latins, Lacedaemonians, Corinthians, Medes, Macedonians, Lydians, Romans (kings), Persians, Alexandrians, Antigoniads, Seleucids, and Romans (emperors). The original version of the Leipzig Chronograph no doubt contained similar lists. Beyond that we cannot tell what it contained. We have no evidence for a text with regnal lists that also included a proper chronicle (unless one considers the unique two volumes of Eusebius's *Chronographia* and *Chronici canones*), so it seems unlikely that after the regnal lists the Chronograph would have offered an expanded account of Greek history from the sixth century onwards, as the Parian Marble does in the fifth and fourth centuries. So little survives both in the papyrus and from other early texts of Greek chronography that we simply cannot make a reasonable guess.

The Chronograph's king lists involve a number of peculiarities. First of all, the list of Babylonian kings encompasses only 168 years and contains only four names. There is no room for any further Babylonian kings, since the list ends on line fifteen of column III with the *κατάλυσις* of the Babylonian kingdom and the Egyptian king list seems to start at line twenty-nine. Fragments of what seems to be a king list appear in this lacuna but their character cannot be determined. This is peculiar. Although we know very little about the Hellenistic king lists of the Babylonians (or rather the 'Chaldaeans' as they were called), we do know that they included scores of immediately post-diluvian kings who reigned for thousands of years. Eusebius (quoting Alexander Polyhistor, who was quoting Berossus's *Babyloniaca*) says that there were eighty-six kings between the flood (of Babylonian myth) and the capture of Babylon by the Medes (no doubt the *κατάλυσις* mentioned by the Chronograph) and they reigned for 33,091 years (Berossus, *FgrHist*, 680 F5a = Eusebius, *Chron.*, p. 12.17–27; Syncellus says 34,090 years: *Ecl. chron.*, p. 88.16).<sup>3</sup> This is a reasonable reflection of the Babylonian traditions that we know from Babylonian sources.<sup>4</sup> Although Berossus and Polyhistor listed all eighty-six kings, Eusebius did not, so we have no means of evaluating the two and one half surviving names in the Chronograph against the Hellenistic tradition. The Chronograph

<sup>3</sup> It may be that, as late Roman historians, the authors of the present book are too familiar with the well-known fabrication that is the *Historia Augusta* — a set of imperial biographies, notionally written by six different authors early in the fourth century and actually written at the end of the fourth century by a single author — but to us, the enormous discrepancy in years almost seems like a joke.

<sup>4</sup> See the table in Verbrugge and Wickersham 1996: 72–73. The passages referred to here are also translated there pp. 51–52, 54–57, and 61.

also shows no parallels with the names found in Babylonian sources. In the Hellenistic traditions, again, there were eight Median dictators or tyrants who reigned for 224 years, a further eleven kings of unknown origin and unknown duration, then forty-nine Chaldaean kings lasting 458 years, nine Arab kings lasting 245 years, and forty-five Assyrian kings lasting 526 years (F 5a, Eusebius, *Chron.*, pp. 12.28–13.8). Eusebius then names the last nine Babylonian kings, from Sennacherib (whom we can date to 689–681 BC) to Nabonidus (556–539; F 7c, 9b = Eusebius, *Chron.*, pp. 14.14–19, 15.5–10), for a total of 144 years.<sup>5</sup> These nine kings, from the destruction of Babylon by the Assyrian king Sennacherib to the conquest of Babylon by the Persian king Cyrus, at the end of the Babylonian Empire, are the closest the Leipzig Chronograph comes to any aspect of the known Hellenistic tradition. That must mean that whatever sort of list survives in the Leipzig papyrus, it is so completely corrupted (or fabricated) that it is of no value at all.

The Egyptian list has already been the object of a study by Popko and Rücker and their conclusions are just as disappointing as ours for the Babylonians.<sup>6</sup> Further study shows that the list seems to contain a number of corrupted names of pharaohs from the Third to the Twenty-sixth Dynasties that we find in the Hellenistic lists that derive from Manetho, though not in any obvious order.<sup>7</sup> The rest, like those in the Babylonian list, appear to be completely corrupted or fictitious. Particularly noticeable is the constant repetition and minor variants: Smendes/Medes/Zmendas, Amenophris/Amenophis, Userthos (*quater*)/Usorthos/Uerthos (*bis*), S[.]ites (*bis*), Sesyncheis (*bis*)/Sesonches, Psonsames (*ter*), and Sebenchos (*bis*).

A number of interesting parallels between the list of Egyptian pharaohs in the Leipzig Chronograph and those in Africanus (= Afr.) and Eusebius's *Chronici canones* (= Eus.), which latter derive ultimately from Manetho via Alexander Polyhistor, are not presented as clearly as they could be by Popko and Rücker. We present those parallels below with the relevant page numbers from Africanus and Eusebius. The dynasty for each is marked with a D along with the pharaoh's order within that dynasty as numbered by Africanus and Eusebius. They are presented in the order in which they appear in the Chronograph.

<sup>5</sup> The figure is actually 164, but the Armenian translation of Eusebius mistakenly assigns two kings eighteen and twelve years instead of eight and two. For all these kings in the Hellenistic traditions and the Babylonian sources, see the notes in Verbrugghe and Wickersham 1996: 52, 54–56, 74–81.

<sup>6</sup> See Popko and Rücker 2011, esp. p. 58.

<sup>7</sup> A table comparing Manetho's list with the evidence from Egyptian sources can be found in Verbrugghe and Wickersham 1996: 185–203.

Smendes (etc.) = Afr. 112 (D21.1); Smendis, Eus. 71 (D21.1)

Amenophris = Amenophthis, Afr. 110 (D18.3), 112 (D21.4); Ammenophthis, Eus. 76 (D21.4)

Userthos (etc.) (Οὐσέρθως) = Osorthon (Ὀσορθών), Afr. 112 (D22.2) and Eus. 81 (D22.2), 84 (D22.5)

S[.]ites = Saïtes, Afr. 108 (D15.1)

Sesyncheis (Σεσύγγεις) = Sesonchis (Σέσωγγις), Afr. 112 (D22.1); Sesonchosis, Afr. 106 (D12.1) and Eus. 79 (D22.1)

Psonsames (Ψονσάμης) = Psusennes (Ψουσέννης), Afr. 112 (D21.2, 7) and Eus. 73 (D21.2), 77 (D21.7)

Amoses = Amosis, Afr. 116 (D26.8) and Eus. 33 (D18.1); Amos, Afr. 110 (D18.1)

Amenophis = Afr. 110 (D18.8); Ammenophis, Eus. 35 (D18.3), 38 (D18.7), 56 (D19.3);

Syphois = Soyphis, Afr. 102 (D3.5)

Another problem with the list in the Chronograph is its division into two sections and the sentences that suggest that the second part actually belongs to another kingdom: ‘The kingdom of the Egyptians lasted for {years} years. After them ruled [...]’ (col. IV, lines 7–9). But that is patently not accurate, as can be seen in spite of the corruption. Perhaps the text originally referred to some later dynasty, but the material as a whole is very disappointing, seemingly nothing more than a jumble of corrupted names from Manetho.

Apart from the Parian Marble, the closest text that we have to the first part of the Leipzig Chronograph is probably column B of the *Chronicon Romanum*, which offers a somewhat similar, and equally random, selection of historical events, though all dated in relation to the time of writing (see Appendix 4.2 above). Our real problem in understanding the Leipzig Chronograph is the almost complete loss of pre-Christian Greek chronographic writing with which to compare it. The king lists have parallels in early Christian apologetic of the later second century AD and in Justus of Tiberias’s *Ιουδαίων βασιλεῖς οἱ ἐν τοῖς στέμμασιν*, and the innumerable *χρονικοὶ κανόνες* (‘chronological tables’) mentioned by Plutarch (*Solon*, 27. 1), both of the first century. Castor of Rhodes may have compiled a work that was based on chronologies and regnal lists in the middle of the first century BC, and there is something similar in *FgrHist*, 258, the second-century AD fragment of an archon list, which is obviously not from a Christian work.<sup>8</sup> It was no doubt works

<sup>8</sup> See Chapters 2 and 3 above for all these texts.

like these and the Leipzig Chronograph that inspired Christian apologists, Africanus, and the author of the *Συναγωγὴ χρόνων*/*Liber generationis* to employ regnal lists in their works. The *Συναγωγὴ χρόνων*/*Lib. gen.* is perhaps another surviving analogue to what we have in the Leipzig Chronograph, though the former is concerned with Old Testament chronology chiefly, whereas the Leipzig Chronograph deals with Greek prehistory. Also instructive is the telling use of the word ἀναγραφή in column III, line 3 to introduce the regnal lists. Eusebius also refers to Berossus's ἡ τῶν βασιλέων ἀναγραφή ('record/account of the kings') that appeared in his *Babyloniaca* (Eusebius, *Chron.*, p. 7.25–26 = Syncellus, *Ecl. chron.*, p. 29.19–20 = Berossus, *FgrHist*, 680 F 1). As we have seen above, the word was commonly used as a title for probable chronicles as well as other chronological and chronicle-like texts.<sup>9</sup>

The Leipzig Chronograph is therefore not the earliest surviving Christian world chronicle, but it is the earliest extant Hellenistic-style chronograph. It may have been part of a longer work that presented many more regnal lists, but the lack of evidence for other early Greek chronographic writing makes further hypothesizing pointless. It is a unique example of this sort of work, but it is unfortunate and disappointing that such a shoddy and corrupt work should have been the one to survive for so many centuries.

<sup>9</sup> Demetrius of Phaleron wrote an Ἀρχόντων ἀναγραφή (*Register of Archons*; *FgrHist*, 228). Diogenes Laërtius calls the chronicle of Stesicrides the Athenian Ἀρχόντων καὶ Ὀλυμπιονικῶν ἀναγραφή (*Register of Archons and Olympic Victors*; *FgrHist*, 245 F 3); Menander of Ephesus/Pergamon wrote a Χρονικῶν ἀναγραφή (*FgrHist*, 783); a variety of works were called Ὀλυμπιονικῶν ἀναγραφή (see Christesen 2007: 161–227); and Sosibius of Laconia wrote a work that Clement of Alexandria called Χρόνων ἀναγραφή but Athenaeus called Περί χρόνων (*FgrHist*, 595).

## Appendix 7

### *Eusebius's Sources for Secular History and the Identities of Cassius Longinus and Thallus*

Before embarking on a discussion of Cassius Longinus and Thallus (postponed from Chapter 2), we must first deal with the problem of the source list that appears in the Armenian translation of Eusebius's *Chronographia*. The background to this problem is set out by Christesen quite well, and any interested reader should begin with him and then consider Mosshammer (Christesen 2007: 250–76 and Mosshammer 1979: 129–46, esp. pp. 138–46). We shall assume knowledge of both to keep this appendix within reasonable bounds.

#### 1. Eusebius's Source List

Embedded within the first paragraph of Eusebius's introduction to Roman chronology in the Armenian translation of the *Chronographia* is a list of sources, with the following introduction: 'Nachdem zusammengetragen ist das sämtliche Erörterte aus den Denkmälern, die hier der Reihe nach verzeichnet sind [list appears here] ist's Zeit auch zu des Römerreiches Zeiten hinzueilen' (p. 125.6–7, 26; 'After all of what has been discussed has been collected from the records listed here in order [list appears here] it is now time to hasten on to the period of the Roman empire'). The sources named are Alexander Polyhistor, Abydenus, Manetho, Cephalion, Diodorus Siculus, Cassius Longinus, Phlegon, Castor of Rhodes, Thallus, and Porphyry, and most include a book total and/or the chronological limits of the work. With the exception of Cassius Longinus, Phlegon, and Thallus, all are cited and quoted, sometimes extensively, earlier in the text of the work for every kingdom save that of the Hebrews. There can be no question, therefore, that this list belongs *before* the Roman preface, which it introduces, and that it is a list of the sources used for the previous part of the text, the chronological analysis of secular history, and is a conclusion to that portion of the work, which through textual corruption in either the original Greek or Armenian texts became embedded within the introduction to Roman history.

The major sources for sacred history (the 'Hebrews' section) — the Old Testament (in three different versions), Maccabees, Josephus, Africanus, and Clement — are noted earlier and frequently within their own section of the *Chronographia* and are mentioned again in the *Canones* (*Chron.*, pp. 34.10–13 (the sacred history

source list), 47.7–8, 48.8–10, 53.34–35, 54.1, 56.19, 57.24 and 26, and 61.11–12, and *Chron. can.*, praef. (pp. 4.5, 7.15–16), 100<sup>a</sup>, 105<sup>d</sup>, 113<sup>a</sup>.<sup>1</sup>

With regard to the many *cruces* in interpreting this list of sources for secular history, we believe that Christesen is correct in concluding that this list covers both the *Chronographia* and the *Canones* and therefore does not include any references to works cited at second- or third-hand, as scholars like Schwartz and Mosshammer were forced to conclude by their line of reasoning (Christesen 2007: 259–64).<sup>2</sup> This explains the presence of Phlegon in the list, who is cited in the *Canones*, as can

<sup>1</sup> This list only includes the citations for pre-Roman sacred history. Strangely, Clement is often cited (*Chron.*, pp. 48.10, 57.24, 26, and *Chron. can.*, praef. (p. 7. 15), 100<sup>a</sup>, 105<sup>d</sup>) but is not mentioned in the 'Hebrews' source list (p. 34.10–13). It has often been thought that Josephus was only known to Eusebius through Africanus (Mosshammer 1979: 133–34 (see his n. 8), 141, 'Eusebius [...] acknowledges in the bibliography for that section and in one of the chronological discussions (61 Karst) that it was through Africanus that he used material from Josephus'; and Christesen 2007: 271 (also citing 61 Karst)), but Eusebius says no such thing and the hypothesis is unlikely, given the large number of quotations from and references to Josephus in both the *Chronographia* and the *Canones*. What Eusebius says is, first, 'In what follows we have arranged the chronography of the Hebrews from Moses and from those books that are handed down among the Hebrews after him, and from the *Jewish Antiquities* of Flavius Josephus, and from Africanus's *Chronographiae*' (Africanus, *Chronographiae*, T 80c, trans. by Wallraff from the Armenian = Eusebius, *Chron.*, p. 34.10–13); second, that after Simon, Hyrcanus led the Jews, 'καθὼς Ἀφρικανὸς καὶ Ἰώσηπος ἱστορεῖ' ('as Africanus and Josephus record'; Africanus, *Chronographiae*, F 85 = Eusebius, *Chron.*, p. 61.11–12); and, third, 'Ea uero, quae post haec apud eos gesta sunt, exhibebimus de libro Macchabaeorum et Iosephi et Africani scriptis, qui deinceps uniuersam historiam usque ad Romana tempora persecuti sunt' ('However, that which afterwards happened among them, we shall present from the book of the Maccabees and the writings of Josephus and Africanus, who narrated all history from that point to Roman times'; *Chron. can.*, 113<sup>a</sup> = Africanus, *Chronographiae*, T 80a–b). None of the material attributed to Josephus in the *Chronographia* or *Canones* is attributed to Africanus in the collections of Routh or Wallraff.

<sup>2</sup> Eusebius cites and/or quotes a number of authors throughout the pre-Roman portion of the *Chronographia* who are not cited in his source list: Apollodorus, Hellanicus, Ctesias, Megasthenes, Philostratus, Dius, Herodotus, Clement of Alexandria, and Berossus. With the exception of Clement, who is cited in both the *Chronographia* and *Canones* (see below and note 1 above), these are all second- and third-hand references. Schwartz and Mosshammer concluded that Cassius Longinus, Phlegon, and Thallus were cited only as second- and third-hand sources for the Olympic victor list (since all used Olympiads for their chronologies), but there is no reason why Eusebius would list these three second- and third-hand authors but none of the others. Mosshammer also believed that Diodorus was a second-hand reference, since he believed that Eusebius derived all Diodorus's material from Porphyry (1979: 135–36, 139–40). For corrections to Christesen's list of stated sources in the *Canones* for pre-Roman history (table 17, p. 262), see 'Appendix 7.1, note 2' in the Appendices to the Footnotes, pp. 380–81 below.

be seen in 'Appendix 7.1, note 2' in the Appendices to the Footnotes (p. 380 below). Christesen is also correct in his conclusion that the Greek text underlying the Armenian translation was corrupt to some degree, especially in the section on Greek history, and had lost at least some source attributions (2007: 253–55).<sup>3</sup>

In the *Chronographia*, among the chronological analyses of the nations whose leaders form the *fila regnorum* (the columns of regnal years) of the *Canones*, is a list of Olympic victors.<sup>4</sup> This victor list is unique and so is of great value for modern scholarship, and yet it has no source attribution. Needless to say, scholars are particularly interested in knowing the origin of this unique and valuable compilation. Scholarship before the discovery of the Armenian translation and its source list attributed the victor list to Africanus, since the date of both the list and Africanus's *Chronographiae* was the same (Olymp. 249, AD 221). Once the Armenian translation was discovered and it became clear that Africanus was not named in the secular source list, it was thought that Eusebius must have recorded Africanus's sources (Cassius Longinus, Phlegon, and Thallus) in the list instead of Africanus himself, since only the victor list could not be attributed (one way or another) to a named source in the list and only these three sources from the list could not be attributed to any other historical section of the *Chronographia*. In 1979, however, Mosshammer argued that the source was instead Porphyry's chronicle (Porphyry is named by Eusebius as a source), though he still maintained that Eusebius listed

<sup>3</sup> The evidence for this is as follows. First, there is the position of the source list in the middle of what should be the following paragraph introducing Roman history. Next, there is the garbled order of the individual nations (see Christesen 2007: 254, table 15) where there are serious disagreements in the three lists Eusebius presents for Greek history between the Ptolemies and the Romans, particularly in the order of the actual discussions themselves. Finally, there is the loss of source attributions to a number of the historical sections, particularly the Olympic victor list, though it must be admitted that there is nothing to prove that every section did, in fact, have source attributions originally. Christesen claims that the entire Armenian translation of Eusebius's chronicle, as well as the Greek fragments of the *Chronographia*, are actually from Panodorus's reworked version of Eusebius from the early fifth century, solely on the basis of a clearly intrusive third-person reference to Eusebius that appears after the Greek text of the Olympic victor list, which is in fact part of a later compilation, not a straight text of the *Chronographia* itself (Christesen and Martirosova-Torlone 2006: 38–40, 48; Christesen 2007: 235–40, 251–52, 255). But there is nothing to connect the extant texts of the *Chronographia* with Panodorus, who is not known to have ever reworked the *Chronographia* and whose reworking of the *Canones* seems to have resulted in a text that looked more like Africanus or Syncellus.

<sup>4</sup> Mosshammer 1979: 138–45; for the text of the Olympiad victor list, see Schoene 1875: 193–220 and Christesen 2007: 386–407; for a text and translation, see Africanus, *Chronographiae*, F 65 (pp. 192–219) and Christesen and Martirosova-Torlone 2006.

Porphyry's sources for this list as well: the well-known Cassius Longinus (c. 213–72; on whom see section 2 below) as Porphyry's direct source, and then Phlegon and Thallus (see section 3 below) as Cassius's sources (Mosshammer 1979: 141–43).

Unfortunately for Mosshammer's argument, Porphyry never wrote a chronicle (see Chapter 2, p. 90), and from what we know of Porphyry's chronological endeavours (which is, admittedly, limited) there is simply no place for an Olympic victor list in either the *Φιλόσοφος ιστορία* (*History of Philosophy*) or the *Κατὰ Χριστιανῶν* (*Against the Christians*). So the list cannot derive from Porphyry. As a result, in his analysis Christesen returned to the view that the immediate source was Africanus and concluded that Africanus's source was an otherwise unknown Cassius Longinus who wrote c. 212, as first suggested by Burgess (1999: 32–33 n. 12; Christesen 2007: 250–51, 268–72).<sup>5</sup> There has always been strong evidence that the victor list does in fact derive from Africanus, in spite of Mosshammer's arguments against it, so Christesen is no doubt correct in at least this part of his conclusion.<sup>6</sup>

The main problem with the other half of Christesen's conclusion, of course, is the fact that he earlier argued that the source list does not contain any second-hand references (as noted above), but he here concludes that Cassius was a second-hand reference. More important, he misses the fundamental point of Burgess's analysis (reemphasized in Burgess 2006a: 37–38 n. 78) that the victor list, as it stood in Africanus's source, must have been a stand-alone list (see Christesen 2007: 267 n. 43). This is proved by the title, which mentions the list's conclusion in Olymp. 247 in the reign of Caracalla (thus December 211 to summer 213); by the obvious continuation at the end, made by the addition of the two victors of Olymp. 248 and 249 (summers of 213 and 217); and by the failure to extend the list of emperors for that continuation. Had Africanus excerpted the list himself from a full Olympiad chronicle (say that of Cassius Longinus) and added the title himself, he would necessarily have included the final Olympiad (249) and the name of the then emperor (Elagabalus), while the continuation would have contained the names of Macrinus and Elagabalus. Since that is not what we see, Africanus must have found the list virtually as extant in a now unidentifiable source written c. 212 and then added the last two Olympiad victors to bring it up to date, forgetting (or

<sup>5</sup> Burgess, however, failed to take account of Eusebius's dating for Longinus's chronicle (see section 2 below), which contradicts his hypothesis. Christesen fails to notice this.

<sup>6</sup> See Wallraff 2006b: 50–53 for internal arguments in favour of Africanus's authorship, as well as Burgess 2006a: 37–38 n. 78; and Wallraff 2007: xxxiii–xxxiv with n. 84.



ignoring) the title and the emperor list in his source. Africanus did not, therefore, excerpt the list one victor at a time from an Olympiad chronicle, but rather copied it verbatim as a pre-existing list and made two small additions at the end to bring it up to date. Therefore none of the Olympiad historians in the source list — Cassius Longinus, Phlegon, or Thallus — can have been Africanus's source.<sup>7</sup> Africanus's source must instead have been a chronological work — though not one with an annual Olympiad chronology — or more likely simply a complete list of Olympic victors that circulated independently (as we saw in Chapter 2 and Appendix 1).

Now, we know from his own statements in the *Chronographia* and *Canones* that Eusebius used Africanus as a source. He even cites Africanus in the *Canones* with regard to the rulers of the Hebrews and Athenians at the time of the first Olympiad (86<sup>h,k</sup>), so we know he used Africanus for secular chronology, even though his name does not appear in the secular source list. Eusebius can therefore have copied Africanus's list rather than excerpting one for himself from one of the Olympiad chronicles to which he had access, despite the fact that Africanus's list was nine Olympiads short of Eusebius's furthest-reaching Olympiad chronicle (see section 2 below) and twenty-three short of the time of writing. One suspects that no other source available to him contained Olympic victors down to his own time (an Olympiad chronicle need not contain a list of Olympic victors). But whatever the reason, the fact is that Eusebius simply copied the list and did nothing else to it.

So Eusebius excerpted the victor list from Africanus, but did not include Africanus in his secular source list. Why? If we can assume that the source list is complete and the entry on Africanus has not fallen out, then the most economical solution is to posit that Eusebius does not mention Africanus because he had already listed him as a source earlier in the text for sacred history (the Hebrews) and cited him as a source three other times in the *Chronographia* (pp. 34.10–13, 47.7, 48.8, and 61.11). That is, Eusebius had cited Africanus as a source four times and did not feel it was necessary to do so again. The same point holds true of Josephus: he is quoted on Nebuchadnezzar and on the Egyptians (quoting Manetho; *Chron.*, pp. 21.1–25.25 and 70.3–74.7), as well as on the foundation of Tyre (*Chron. can.*, 55<sup>c</sup>), all secular facts, but his name does not appear in the secular source list. He is, however, listed earlier as a source for sacred history. On the other hand, Clement is quoted a number of times in the *Chronographia* and *Canones* (see note 1) but does not appear in either source list in the *Chronographia*. Tatian's

<sup>7</sup> It does not help to suggest that Cassius (or any other Olympiad chronicler) included the list. No Olympiad chronicler would have used Olympiads and Olympic victors as his annual chronological system and then repeated them all in a stand-alone list in the same work.

*Oratio ad Graecos* 31 is clearly the source of *Chron. can.* 66<sup>a</sup> (on Homer), but Tatian is only mentioned in the preface to the *Canones* (p. 7. 15). Put simply, Eusebius was not as careful as we would like him to have been in his reporting of sources.

Having worked out the basics of the source list we can now move on to the two problematic authors listed therein, Cassius Longinus and Thallus, who must have been used by Eusebius but are not otherwise cited by him.

## 2. Cassius Longinus

The source list states that Cassius Longinus's chronicle contained eighteen books and concluded in Olymp. 228 (= AD 133–36; see *BNJ*, T 1 (with correct Olympiad figure) = *Chron.*, p. 125.15–16 (with typographical error in Olympiad figure)). That is too early, for two reasons: first, Eusebius's source list almost certainly logs the Olympiad works he used in descending chronological order (most recent to oldest), and the next work on the list is the chronicle of Phlegon, who concluded in Olymp. 229, so Longinus must have concluded later than that; second, the well-known writer Cassius Longinus, who is probably identical with the homonymous author in Eusebius's list, was born c. 213 and executed in 272 (see *PLRE*, 514–15, s.v. Longinus 2). His productive life therefore probably began in the late 230s, too late for a work written in the 130s. Olymp. 258 ran from 253 to 256, in the middle of Longinus's *floruit*, which suggests that the numeral 228 in the Armenian translation is actually an error for 258 (thus CKH for CNH, a simple copying error in the original Greek, perhaps under the influence of the CKΘ in the next entry). If so, Longinus could have written any time under Gallienus (253–68) and have concluded his chronicle with the end of the previous emperor's reign (Aemilianus was executed in late 253 thus Olymp. 258.1), or he could have written during or shortly after Olymp. 258 (thus c. 253–58).

The well-known Cassius Longinus has often been discounted in modern scholarship as the author of this chronicle since he is not otherwise known to have composed a chronicle (it is not listed in the *Suda* article on him, for instance).<sup>8</sup> But the late fourth-century poet Ausonius is not credited in the ancient sources with a chronicle either, yet as we saw in Chapter 3 he wrote one: Giovanni Mansionario's c. 1320 list of Ausonius's works records, '(Scripsit) cronicam ab initio mundi usque ad tempus suum' (R. Green 1991: 720, lines 18–19; '(He wrote) a chronicle from

<sup>8</sup> See also Janiszewski 2006: 396–98, Christesen 2007: 340, and the commentary in *BNJ*, 259 (Benferhat).

the beginning of the world down to his own time'). There is nothing implausible about a scholar like Longinus writing a chronicle: he is known to have been a grammarian, rhetor, polymath, a 'living library and walking museum' as Eunapius described him, and he had an interest in history.<sup>9</sup> He was Porphyry's teacher, and Porphyry certainly evinced a great interest in chronology. It is well to remember that a pagan Hellenistic chronicle was not just a record of military and political history, but of intellectual history as well: Apollodorus's *Chronica* was invaluable to Philodemus when he was compiling his *Σύνταξις τῶν φιλοσόφων* (*Ordering of the Philosophers*) in the first century BC. For what it is worth, although the argument is highly theoretical, it has been suggested that Eusebius actually had access to Longinus's library.<sup>10</sup> If so, he could have found Longinus's chronicle there; it may never have circulated publicly. The identification is not perfect — the association of homonyms is always more dangerous than one thinks — but it satisfies the logic of Occam's razor better than any other solution so far offered.

Burgess (1999: 31–33, esp. n. 12) once accepted Mosshammer's arguments for the derivation of Eusebius's Olympic victor list from Porphyry and Cassius Longinus, whom he was then forced to identify as an earlier, otherwise unknown historian of the same name, an awkward solution (see note 5 above for a further problem). However, as we have seen above, the list must derive from Julius Africanus and there is no evidence at all for Africanus's source since Eusebius's source list does not include second- or third-hand sources.

Yasmina Benferhat, in her commentary for *BNJ*, 259, offers a bizarre conclusion: she believes that Cassius Hemina, the republican historian of the second century BC, 'remains the most likely' identity for Eusebius's Cassius Longinus, but that can only be true if we discount three of the four facts we actually possess (cognomen, number of books, and date). Furthermore, no republican historian would have dated by Olympiads.

### 3. Thallus

There are a number of complicated problems concerning the identity of Thallus and the coverage of his history (*FgrHist/BNJ*, 256 (Garstad)), so it will be easiest to break the argument into individual steps.

<sup>9</sup> Mosshammer 1979: 142 and esp. Janiszewski 2006: 398–99.

<sup>10</sup> Kalligas 2001.

Let us set aside the evidence of Eusebius's source list (*FgrHist*/*BNJ*, 256 T 1 = *Chron.*, p. 125.22–23) and treat the fragments first. Of all the authors who cite or quote Thallus, only two appear to do so first-hand: Theophilus in c. 185 (F 2, 3a) and Africanus in 221 (*Chronographiae*, F 1, 5a, 7 = F 34.16 and 32 and F 93). As Garstad says (*BNJ*, 256, biographical essay) all the rest (Tertullian, Ps-Justin, Minucius Felix, Lactantius, Eusebius, Malalas, Syncellus) derive from one or the other of these two, or from one another (with the exception of the new *BNJ*, 256 F 3b (Garstad)<sup>11</sup>). Africanus twice pairs Thallus and Castor (*Chronographiae*, F 34. 16 and 32), even saying that both wrote on 'Syrian matters'; T 2, F 5a = Africanus, *Chronographiae*, F 34. 32). Since Castor was a well-known and often-cited source, and Castor wrote a much larger work than Thallus, this similarity of subject matter suggests that Castor was Thallus's chief source, which would place him later than 61 BC, Castor's terminal date.<sup>12</sup>

Almost certainly, Thallus wrote after Phlegon, who completed his chronicle in Olympiad 229, thus autumn 136 to autumn 140, no doubt ending with the death of Hadrian on 10 July 138. Africanus states that Thallus associated the darkness at the time of the crucifixion with an eclipse (*Chronographiae*, F 93. 6–13). We know that Phlegon famously mentioned in the fourth year of Olympiad 202 (therefore AD 31–32) an eclipse that was associated with an earthquake in Nicaea (*FgrHist*, 257 F 16).<sup>13</sup> That was the eclipse of 24 November 29 (thus the second year of Olymp. 202, not the fourth), which was in fact total in Nicaea for one minute and twenty-two seconds at about 10:30 local time. An eclipse and earthquake in Nicaea in 29 is exactly the sort of obscure information that we would expect to have been discovered by Phlegon, who wrote fifteen or sixteen books, rather than by Thallus, who only wrote three. Following Thallus, this eclipse was associated with the darkness of the crucifixion by Africanus (same passage as above), Origen, Eusebius (whence Syncellus, Malalas, and *Chronicon Paschale*), and Philoponus, the latter three with no reference to Thallus, only to Phlegon,

<sup>11</sup> This can be assigned to Thallus only on the assumption that his chronology was unique. If it was not, then there is no proof that this passage derives from Thallus. As a result it must be set aside. However, if it is accepted, it proves knowledge of Thallus much later than the second to fourth centuries.

<sup>12</sup> For Thallus's dependence on Castor, see also Garstad's commentary on *BNJ*, 256 F 3b. Castor ended with the consuls of 61 BC and the archon for 61–60 (*FgrHist*, 250 F 4, 5). See note 15 below.

<sup>13</sup> The great importance of this supposed synchronization for Eusebius and some later Christian writers is explained in 'Appendix 7.3, note 13' of the Appendices to the Footnotes, pp. 381–82 below.

quotations from whom show that he said nothing about the crucifixion. There is also the fictitious reference to the eclipse in Ps-Dionysius, *Ep.* 7. 2 (see 'Appendix 7.3, note 13' in the Appendices to the Footnotes, pp. 381–82 below), which, of course, mentions no sources. One suspects that Africanus is the ultimate source or inspiration for these references, that he made reference to and probably even quoted Phlegon, and that later authors cite Thallus's stated source rather than Thallus himself (or Africanus), as is the usual ancient practice.<sup>14</sup>

Theophilus cites Thallus as his only chronological authority, and since Thallus is otherwise unknown directly outside of Theophilus and Africanus (and Eusebius, for whom see below), who cluster within a period of about forty years, it seems most likely that Theophilus cites him because his work was new and well known to Autolycus, to whom Theophilus was writing. His work therefore probably ended somewhere between *c.* 138 (Phlegon) and *c.* 185 (Theophilus), thus Olympiads 229 to 240.

The eclipse is the latest event we know Thallus to have mentioned. The earliest figures he discussed were Belus, Cronus, and Ogygus and the eponymous founders of cities and territories. Belus he dated 322 years before the Trojan War (F 2, 3a, 5a).

However, in his source list Eusebius limits Thallus's history between the fall of Troy and Olympiad 167, which is 112–109 BC and therefore long before the crucifixion and the eclipse of 29 (*BNJ*, T 1). Since Eusebius is the odd one out among the witnesses to Thallus, the inconsistency must lie with his description. First of all, as we have seen above, Eusebius's source list provides us with the names of the works that Eusebius knew at first hand; there is no evidence that it contains works he did not actually see. If he cites Thallus, he must have looked at his work, if only to have confirmed for himself what Thallus says about the coincidence of the eclipse and the darkness of the crucifixion (which he almost certainly learned off from Africanus). As we note in 'Appendix 7.3, note 13' in the Appendices to the Footnotes (pp. 381–82 below), the quotation that Eusebius attributes to 'pagan records' was likely copied from Thallus, where it would have served as the introduction to his discussion of the darkness at the time of the crucifixion.

<sup>14</sup> Only Syncellus preserves the part of Africanus's fragment that mentions Phlegon (*Ecl. chron.*, p. 391.18–19), and he does not report the details of Phlegon's report that Eusebius and Philoponus preserve. We cannot tell if Africanus originally included them or not. See Wallraff 2007: 279 n. 3 on the authenticity of this reference to Phlegon, which other scholars have dismissed as a gloss by Syncellus. As noted in 'Appendix 7.3, note 13' in the Appendices to the Footnotes (pp. 381–82 below), the author of Ps-Dionysius, *Ep.* 7 had certainly read Africanus.

Eusebius sets Thallus's beginning as the fall of Troy. This could be the result of scribal error, the same phrase having been copied from the entry on Porphyry just below. On the other hand, it may be that Thallus only began his chronology with the Trojan War and included the pre-Trojan mythical material as part of a non-chronological 'preface', as it were. In view of Greek attitudes towards the chronology of the pre-Olympiad period (as we noted for Eratosthenes in Chapter 2), let alone the pre-Trojan period (for which Diodorus Siculus said no trustworthy chronology existed: *Bibliotheca*, 1. 5. 1), this makes perfect sense (see also Christesen 2007: 324–25). However, Theophilus says that Thallus dated Belus 322 years before the Trojan War (*FgrHist/BNJ*, 256 F 3a), which indicates that Thallus did in fact have a chronology for the pre-Trojan period.

Garstad suggests that Thallus did stop his history in 112–109 BC, but wrote at a date closer to Theophilus and discussed the eclipse and the crucifixion in a digression (*BNJ*, 256 biographical essay and F 1 comm.). This is highly unlikely, but perhaps within the realm of possibility.

There is, of course, the possibility of corruption: the Olympiad numbers for Cassius Longinus and Castor are incorrect — 228 for perhaps 258, and 181 instead of 180<sup>15</sup> — and the book total for Phlegon is also incorrect: fourteen instead of fifteen or sixteen. Thus three of the four listed Olympiad chroniclers have corruptions. It is therefore possible that '167' is in fact a number between 229 and 240,

<sup>15</sup> Eusebius's source list gives Olymp. 181 as Castor's terminal date (*Chron.*, p. 125.21). If we assume that Castor used Macedonian civil years as the basis for his chronology, as would be natural, then he set the beginning of Olymp. 180 in the autumn of the consular year for 61 BC and thus roughly correlated it with the archonship of 61–60 (see 'Appendix 7.3, note 13' in the Appendices to the Footnotes (pp. 381–82 below)). It was usual practice for Olympiads used for chronological purposes to be synchronized with the Syro-Macedonian year in which they took place (Burgess 1999: 29 n. 6) rather than the year after, as would be the case with real Olympiads. Thus, because the first Olympiad is said to have taken place in the summer of 776 BC, the beginning of that Olympiad year was synchronized with the beginning of the Macedonian civil year that began in the autumn of 777 BC. The first year of the first chronological Olympiad is therefore 777–776, not 776–775 as would be the case with a real Olympiad. For examples of this use, see Burgess 1999: 33–34 (Olympic victor list) and Burgess 2006a: 39 (Africanus). Understanding this helps to reduce the error of Eusebius's Olympiad total for Castor. The second half of 61 BC is technically Olymp. 179.4 (since the Olympic games did not take place until the summer of 60 BC), yet the text of Eusebius assigns Castor's work 181 Olympiads. It is not easy to explain an error of 181 for 179 (in Greek or Armenian). However, if Castor treated his Olympiads as chronological Olympiads as set out above, and not as real Olympiads, he would have counted the end of 61 BC as the first year of Olymp. 180. This would make the error in the Armenian translation of 181 for 180 a mere copying error and therefore much easier to explain.

the Olympiads of Phlegon and Theophilus (see above). Such a change would be difficult in Greek (167 is PEZ and numbers beginning 220, 230, and 240 are CK-, CA-, CM-) but perhaps less so in Armenian.<sup>16</sup> Since the list is written in a descending chronological order, at some point after the corruption the entry would then have to have been moved to its final position in the list, to maintain the order.<sup>17</sup> While certainly quite possible, this is perhaps an overly complicated explanation.

But what if it had been Eusebius himself who made the error? What if he combined the name and book total from Thallus with the chronological limits of another work? He was working with many different sources, Thallus certainly much less frequently than others (and indeed perhaps only once), and such an error would not be impossible, although it would require the existence of another work possessing the chronological limits that Eusebius ascribed to Thallus. Such an error is made more plausible by the fact that Thallus may not have written an Olympiad chronicle at all and so does not even belong in this part of the list (see 'Chapter 2, note 87' in the Appendices to the Footnotes, p. 365 below). It just so happens that we do know of a work that extended from the fall of Troy to Olympiad 167 (autumn 113 to autumn 109 BC), the limits Eusebius attributes to Thallus: a well-known prose adaptation and continuation of the *Chronica* of Apollodorus, as we know from the testimony of Philodemus, went down to the archonship of Polycleitus (110–109 BC; *FgrHist*, 244 F 56 = *Index Academicorum*, col. 25.15–16).<sup>18</sup> It is hard to believe that the coincidence of chronological limits between the prose Apollodorus and the dates Eusebius assigns to Thallus could be mere accident. All the same, and an obvious objection, there is no evidence that Eusebius used Apollodorus first-hand. All but one reference (*Chron. can.*, 84<sup>f</sup>, on Lycurgus) are clearly derived from another source, such as Polyhistor, Porphyry, and Diodorus (including *Chron. can.*, 66<sup>a</sup>, on Homer). The point is not actually relevant, however. Eusebius need not have used the prose Apollodorus as a first-hand source for this type of error to have occurred. He need only have known the dates at which the prose Apollodorus began and ended, which were probably widely known given the fame of the work, which we saw in Chapter 2 and Appendix 1. This confusion would fit with Eusebius's having used Thallus only briefly, as seems to have been the case.

The lack of meaningful evidence gives us no means of determining the truth of all these possibilities, but an error by Eusebius would seem to be the best solution to this long-standing interpretative crux.

<sup>16</sup> See Karst 1911: xii–xiii.

<sup>17</sup> See Mosshammer 1979: 144 and Christesen 2007: 325.

<sup>18</sup> Jacoby 1902: 389.

Appendix 8

*Livy's Foundation Date*

Surprisingly, given his title of *Ab urbe condita*, Livy never gives an absolute foundation date for the city.<sup>1</sup> The date from which he seems to have worked can be deduced from internal evidence, however. Between 507 and 300 BC, his fasti are missing seven consular years in comparison to our modern Varronian chronology, which implies a foundation date of 746 BC, one year lower than that of Fabius Pictor.<sup>2</sup> His few stated AUC dates, however, are not calculated from that date; they are, moreover, inconsistent with one another as well. The table below lists all Livy's AUC dates. The first column gives the text reference ('Ref.'), the second the modern (Varronian) year equivalent of the names of Livy's consuls ('= BC'), and the third is Livy's stated AUC year for those consuls ('AUC'). The fourth column is the foundation date obtained if we apply Livy's stated AUC date to his BC date according to Varronian chronology, which we know he did not use ('VFD'). The last column is Livy's implied foundation date if we apply his stated AUC dates to his actual chronology ('LFD'). In both 'VFD' and 'LFD' the correct figures from the 'AUC' column (364 and 552) have been applied.

Ref.	= BC	AUC	VFD	LFD
1. 60. 3	510	244	753	746
3. 33. 1	452	302	753	748
4. 7. 1	444	310	753	748
5. 54. 5	390	365 <sup>3</sup>	753	748
7. 18. 1	354	400 <sup>4</sup>	753	749

<sup>1</sup> For this problem in general, see Bayet 1947: cxii–cxxvi, which is somewhat confused. This appendix is offered as a shorter, more accurate, and more complete account of the problem.

<sup>2</sup> Livy misses our 'Varronian' years 507, 490, 489, 376, 333, 324, 309, and 301, and includes an extra set of consuls between 506 and 505. He counts the same number of years for the kings as does the Varronian system: 244 (1. 60. 3).

<sup>3</sup> This is a rhetorical error that arises because of the importance of the number 365: see Feeney 2007: 100–04, 141. It should be 364 AUC, as can be seen from the figures that work out to 753 and 748 (which have been calculated using 364).

<sup>4</sup> But it is the thirty-sixth not the 'thirty-fifth year' (as Livy says) after the Gallic sack in 5. 54. 5. Livy is counting with the erroneous AUC date of 365. This is important because it shows that even when Livy used the AUC dates to make chronological calculations, he did not count consular pairs.



<i>Ref.</i>	<i>= BC</i>	<i>AUC</i>	<i>VFD</i>	<i>LFD</i>
31. 1. 4	264	488	751	751
31. 5. 1	200	551 <sup>5</sup>	751	751

As can be seen, Livy's stated AUC dates, when applied to his own text ('LFD'), are inconsistent because seven Varronian years are missing in roughly three different places. As his chronology extends through those points his implied foundation dates jump further out of synchronization with one another. It is obvious, then, first, that his AUC dates cannot have been calculated against his own fasti; they must derive from his sources. Second, this shows that he worked out his own consular list and judged the 'authenticity' of each consular pair according to his own rules, rather than copying someone else's list. Unfortunately, it never occurred to him that such a practice would disrupt the chronology of his few AUC dates, which may have been regarded as 'canonical' and known by many or most readers, hence the need to include them. Third, the assumption of Varronian fasti provides a consistent result except for the last two dates, which refer to the Punic Wars. These first five dates must, therefore, derive from a source that dated the foundation to 753. On the other hand, the last two dates must derive from a different source, one that, like the earliest Roman historians, accepted 751 as a foundation date (e.g. Cn. Gellius, Cassius Hemina, and Cato). Livy's implied foundation date ('LFD') matches the Varronian-based foundation date ('VFD') in these last two instances because the last of his missing Varronian years was 301 and after that his consular list matches all other lists. It is clear, then, that Livy took his AUC dates unchanged from his sources and never bothered to check his overall chronology to work out what his own foundation date would have been or what his actual AUC dates would have been on the basis of that foundation date.

<sup>5</sup> Livy has made a mistake; the figure should be 552, which provides the foundation date of 751 in the last two columns. In 31. 1 he assigns year 488 AUC to the consul of 264 and correctly places the beginning of the First Punic War here. He correctly states that the Second Punic War ended sixty-three years later (not counting 264, which has been taken as part of the 488 years AUC). His AUC date in 31. 5 is 551, which is 488 + 63, and thus the last year of the Second Punic War (201), but he mistakenly assigns it to the consuls of 200 and the beginning of the Second Macedonian War. It should also be mentioned that the manuscripts give these numbers as 478 and 541, i.e. ten years too short, but the emendation is necessary because the manuscript numbers would produce a foundation date of 741, which would be unique and far outside the range of dates debated during Livy's era.



## APPENDICES TO THE FOOTNOTES

The following texts proved to be too long to be footnotes and so, following the precedent set by the Budé series of editions and French translations of Greek and Latin classical texts, we have placed them here in their own appendix.

### Chapter 1, note 11

But in spite of enlightened views such as those of White, the old depreciation persists: thus Vincent 2006: 32, positing an American and Englishman watching a cricket match as an example of the distinction of evidence and meaning: ‘The American, left to himself, will not grasp what cricket is about just by being an onlooker. He will, of course, see that after six balls, the players changed ends. That is an empirical historical fact. It describes, but does not explain. It leaves intention rather in the dark. It is chronicle, as opposed to history.’ A comment such as, ‘Medieval chroniclers occasionally rose above their annals to reflect and explicate’ is typical (Elton 2002: 2). See also Meier 2007: 237–39. For Fornara the twin characteristics of ‘the arrangement of events in a mechanically sequential pattern [...] without regard for the interrelation of events’ and ‘the juxtaposition of incommensurables’ (i.e. parataxis) — two of the fundamental characteristics of a chronicle, as we shall see below — prevent chronicles from being considered history, and not just ‘proper’ history, but history *tout court*: ‘The genres are connected only in their common utilization of some of the data of the past’ (1983: 29). See also Croke 2001b: 291–92.

Sadly, all this is just a modern continuation of an old prejudice. Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*Antiquitates Romanae*, 1. 8. 3) and Sempronius Asellio (Aulus Gellius, *NA*, 5. 18. 8–9 = Asellio frags 1–2 = Chassignet 1999: 84–85) refer to early overtly chronological works — *Atthides* (on which see Chapter 2) and early

Roman histories (Appendix 2) respectively — in a disparaging way. We may also cite Plutarch's comment about Solon's interview with Croesus: the story was so good that Plutarch was not going to let anything as trivial as chronology (i.e. the fact that they didn't live at the same time) get in the way of his believing it. The chroniclers never agree among themselves so why bother fussing (*Solon*, 27. 1)? Similarly, there were so many seemingly obvious proofs that Numa and Pythagoras were acquainted with one another (*Numa*, 8. 4–10) that Plutarch could hardly let something as late and lacking in authority as the Olympic victor list of Hippias of Elis get in the way (*Numa*, 1. 4); he did, however, realize that he was on shaky chronological ground (*Numa*, 8. 10). Although it is too long to quote in its entirety, we must also draw attention to the attack of Eunapius on the *Χρονικὴ ἱστορία* (*Chronographic History*) of Dexippus who, as we see in Appendix 1, tried to combine the chronological interests of chronicles with normal narrative history (F 1, pp. 6–11, Blockley 1983). He says, among other things,

For what do dates contribute to the wisdom of Socrates or the acuity of Themistocles? Were they great men only during the summer? Did you see them growing and shedding their virtues like leaves according to the time of the year? [...] Of what relevance was it to the aim of history to learn that the Greeks won the sea-battle at Salamis when the dog-star was rising? Of what use was it for the reader's historical education to learn that on a particular day so-and-so was born, who later became a leading poet or playwright? [...] This is especially so since, as Dexippus himself points out, while all, or the majority, of chronologies are discrepant, there is absolute agreement over the famous events that are of more than local importance. [...] But I declare to my readers here and now that I have approached this work confident in my own ability to write about the past and the present and have declined to date events by the year or the day on the ground that the practice is irrelevant, preferring as more accurate to use the reigns of emperors as my time-divisions. My reader will learn that a certain action was performed during the reign of a certain emperor, but leave it to others to dance off the delusion of dating by year and day.

Such judgements, ancient and modern, are unwarranted. As we note below, historical and chronographic genres served such completely different purposes that to attempt any qualitative comparison between them is misconceived, today as in antiquity.

## Chapter 1, note 32

An example of the sort of circular reasoning this importation of modern ideas into medieval texts causes can be found in Coleman 2007: 3:

Annals and chronicles have different origins [...]. Through time, however, the distinctions between annals and chronicles became blurred, as medieval writers noted. Gervase of

Canterbury, writing in the late twelfth century, for example, states that the purpose of *both* chronicles *and* annals was to record events, portents, miracles, and the deeds of princes within an accurate chronological framework. But in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries [... scholars] tended once again to separate annals and chronicles into distinct generic categories.

Since ‘annals’ did not exist as a separate genre in the Middle Ages, named or not, ‘annals’ and ‘chronicles’ cannot have had different origins and therefore Gervase cannot have ‘blurred’ anything that relates to them. Under the undoubted (direct or indirect) influence of Gellius (and probably that of Cicero, too) Gervase uses ‘annals’ as a synonym for ‘chronicle’ (for Gervase, see Appendix 2). He is talking about one thing, and one thing only, what we in this volume call ‘chronicles’, and he is contrasting them with *historiae*, ‘histories’, both of which he describes well enough that we can easily understand what he is talking about (see our comparison of the two in the ‘Genre 2’ section in Chapter 1). Coleman, however, imports a modern medievalist’s definition of ‘annals’ and ‘chronicle’ into his reading of Gervase, as well as all the baggage associated with them, and therefore cannot see what Gervase is actually saying. The hypothesis has come first and the evidence is subservient to it. We should note that the views presented here do not originate with Coleman: he is simply following a well-worn path, on which see Dumville 2002: 5–6 and Chapter 1, note 8. Another example of this type of circular argument can be found in Appendix 2, p. 290, above.

## Chapter 1, note 50

Isidore used a large number of similar terms to describe his chronicle epitome and the chronicles of earlier authors. In *Chron.* 1–2 he refers to his epitome as a ‘temporum summa’ (‘chronological summary’) that included an ‘e latere descendens linea temporum’ (‘column of chronologies running down the side’), a reference to the marginal summary of years from Creation at each accession entry. The work of Africanus is called a ‘brevis temporum’ (‘short account of chronologies’), the chronicle of Eusebius and Jerome a ‘chronicorum canonum multiplex historia regnis simul ac temporibus ordinata’ (‘complex history made up of chronological tables arranged by kingdoms in chronological order’), but that of Victor is not described, just its contents. In *Etymologiae* 5. 39 he calls the third edition of his chronicle epitome a ‘descriptio temporum’. In *Etymologiae* 5. 28 he calls a ‘chronica’ a ‘temporum series’ and uses Eusebius-Jerome as an example. The manuscripts of the work itself vary considerably, calling the work a ‘chronica’ (singular), ‘chronographia’, ‘liber chronicorum’, ‘liber χρονικῶρων [*sic*]’, ‘liber chronicorum’,

‘chronicon’, ‘expositio temporum’, ‘brevis temporum expositio’, ‘liber breuiarium [sic] temporum’, and, the edition of 626 only, ‘liber de ordine temporum’ (‘a book on the ordering of chronologies’).

## Chapter 1, note 57

Croke’s arguments against identifying consularia as a distinct subgenre of chronicles depend upon certain misrepresentations and exaggerations of Burgess’s earlier work and misconceptions about the works themselves (esp. Croke 2001b: 293–94, 304–28; see also Croke 2001a: 163–64, 184: ‘This distinction in terms of style, content, and authorship is purely artificial and cannot be sustained by the extant chronicle fragments used to justify it’). We shall note only one point here (our position on other matters will be made clear below): an important part of Croke’s argument is the fact that the ancients did not make a distinction between chronicles and consularia because they had no terms for the genres (2001a: 184 and 2001b: 294–304, 331). Yet Croke logically undermines his own objection by showing, correctly, that late Roman writers generally made no terminological distinction between ‘history’ and ‘chronicle’ (2001b: 295, 301, and 303), though he rightly accepts a real generic difference between the two. As we shall see below, Cassiodorus — whom Croke claims made no terminological distinction among ‘history’, ‘chronicle’, and ‘consularia’ (2001b: 295 and 297) — knew exactly what *chronica* were when he defined them in the *Institutiones* (quoted above), giving as examples Eusebius-Jerome, Marcellinus, and Prosper, and knew exactly what he was doing when wrote his own work as consularia, not a chronicle, as we shall see below. Furthermore, he describes his own work as an ‘annorum series’, while in the same sentence calling Jerome’s work ‘chronica’ (*Chron.*, 1365). Burgess has never claimed a distinction between chronicles and consularia on the basis of ancient terminology, and this makes the analysis in Croke 2001b: 294–304 irrelevant to the argument, though still interesting and useful. It is likewise important to stress that consularia are simply a subgenre of chronicles. They may have specific characteristics that distinguish them from other chronicles and they may have independent origins, but they are still a form of chronicle. This is true of chronicles from other cultures and times, as well: even a text as foreign-seeming as the *Zhushu jinian*, the Bamboo Annals, a Chinese chronicle composed in the early third century BC and reportedly discovered towards the end of the third century AD in a royal tomb, is recognizable as a chronicle by the definition we present here, despite its different origins and characteristics. Finally, Croke 2001b: 331 tries to minimize consularia by comparing a count of surviving chronicle and consularia manuscript pages,

concluding that ‘the documents adduced in support of the consularia genre provide a very meagre dossier’. Unfortunately, he ignores the evidence of *Quellenforschung* and therefore fails to take into account the truly extraordinary influence of consularia in the fourth to ninth centuries in providing other chroniclers and historians with a narrative of Western history of the fourth and fifth centuries, as will be explained in detail in Volume II.

### Chapter 1, note 73

Intoiuit Theodosius Augustus in urbem Romam cum Honorio filio suo die iduum Iuniarum et dedit congiarium Romanis (*Descriptio consulum*, 389) = Augustus Theodosius entered the city of Rome with his son Honorius on 13 June and gave largesse to the Romans.

Theodosius Romam introiuit cum Honorio idus Iunias et exiuit inde III kl Septemb. (*Consularia Vindobonensia priora*, 512) = Theodosius entered Rome with Honorius on 13 June and left there on 30 August.

Theodosius imperator cum Honorio filio suo Romam mense Iunio introiuit, congiarium Romano populo tribuit urbeque egressus kal. Septembris (Marcellinus *comes*, 389.1) = Emperor Theodosius entered Rome with his son Honorius in the month of June, bestowed largesse on the Roman people, and left the city on 1 September.

εἰσήλθεν Θεοδοσίος ὁ βασιλεὺς ἐν Ῥώμῃ μετὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ Ὀνωρίου, καὶ ἔσπευσεν αὐτὸν ἐκεῖ εἰς βασιλεῖα (*Chronicon Paschale*, s.a. 389, p. 564) = Emperor Theodosius entered Rome with his son Honorius and there crowned him emperor.

ἦλθε Θεοδοσίος ἐν Ῥώμῃ μετὰ Ὀνωρίου τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐκάθισεν αὐτὸν βασιλεῖα ἐν αὐτῇ πρὸ εἰδῶν Ἰουνίου, καὶ ἀνῆλθεν ἐπὶ Κωνσταντινούπολιν (Theophanes, *Chronographia*, AM 5881, p. 70.31–33) = Theodosius came to Rome with his son Honorius, established him there as emperor on 9 June, and went back to Constantinople.

Hydatius’s version of this entry derives from his version of the *Descriptio* and so is not reported. The *Consularia Golenischevensis* is too fragmentary for comparison here.

### Chapter 2, note 50

There is a growing body of evidence for contacts between Greece and even India under the Achaemenid Empire, which seems to be taking on aspects of a vast multi-cultural entrepôt as a result of widespread Persian conquests in Europe, the Near East, and south-east Asia: see the summary of Hagens 2009: 32–35. For specific arguments for Near Eastern influence on early Greek historiography, see Gozzoli

1970–71: 179–89; Troiani 1983; and Rollinger 2000, though there is no discussion of chronicles or chronography. See also Fornara 1983: 22 n. 44: ‘the first horographers may well have been influenced by Oriental models. Contact with Egypt and Persia, if not Babylonia, will have familiarized them with the form. The fact that Charon (*FgrHist*, 262) appears to have been one of the earlier local historians, while his city, Lampsacus, possessed old Persian connections, is intriguing. Of all Greek forms, horography is closest to Oriental historiography.’ This is to be understood in light of Fornara 1983: 28, where he associates chronography and horography (on which, see Chapter 2, ‘The Prehistory of Greek Chronicles’). Möller 2001 is probably the most important discussion of the development of early Greek chronography, and she attributes the development of annalistic Greek chronography to the ‘oriental documentary model’ (pp. 253–54, 261–62), first developed by Oswyn Murray (2001a: 35–38) with reference to Herodotus. Möller (2001: 253) and Bertelli (2001: 69–71), however, deny any direct influence from Mesopotamian chronicles, but their reasons for doing so suggest that they are not familiar with these chronicles or with what survives of the Greek chronographic tradition down to Eratosthenes. Panchenko (2000: 64), like a number of others who are aware of the evidence, posits a direct link between Assyrian *limmu* lists and the Greek interest in compiling lists of archons and other eponyms.

In addition to the extensive contacts the Greek world had with Mesopotamia from the Archaic period, it is well known that the Persian conquest of Babylon (539) and then Alexander’s conquest of the Persians (331) increasingly opened up the Greek world to the literary products of the Babylonians and Assyrians (the ‘Chaldaeans’, as the Greeks mistakenly called them all), no doubt at first through Greeks who worked and lived with the Persians, as well as through visitors. (See Raaflaub 2000: 60: ‘although overall Mesopotamian influence on Greek culture probably was more comprehensive than that of Egypt, comparable reports of Greek travels to Mesopotamia are rare’.) In this context one must mention the famous historian Callisthenes, who, while travelling in Alexander’s entourage, was asked by his uncle Aristotle to send him astronomical data from Babylon (details in van der Spek 2003: 290 n. 2), though he would obviously have needed help from local scholars and interpreters, a problem in any historical period (see Geller 2000: 1–2 for some suggestions). Nevertheless, Berossus, a local historian who wrote in Greek (see Chapter 3), and no doubt other scholars and historians like him, had no difficulty with original documents, and he seems to have used them extensively for his own work (van der Spek 2008: 287–314). As van der Spek (2008: 313–14) says: ‘Berossus was [...] well versed in Mesopotamian literature. He was familiar with all types of cuneiform literature, king-lists, the *Enuma Elish*, the Ziusudra



story of the flood, Babylonian chronicles, royal inscriptions of Nebuchadnezzar. He was the colleague of the composers of chronicles, prophecies, royal inscriptions, and astronomical diaries. He, himself, may have been the author of some of these texts.’ So there are many possible avenues for the transmission of Mesopotamian historiography to the Greeks. Since the first real chronicle that we know about in any detail (the Parian Marble) post-dates Alexander, the important influences behind the development of Greek chronicles and Greek chronography in the form that we know it in the third century BC could lie anywhere from the mid-fifth to the late fourth centuries. But since there is no evidence on the Greek side, this must all remain conjecture.

## Chapter 2, note 75

Universal history in Greek begins with Ephorus’s thirty-book *Ἱστορίαι* (*Histories*) in the third quarter of the fourth century, so by the time of Eratosthenes the stage had already been set for the massive labour of creating a detailed synchronism of Mediterranean history. For the development of universal histories in Greek, see Clarke 2008: 96–168, and for an interesting — though in some places overly naïve, e.g. her acceptance of the appearance of Olympiads in Apollodorus and the existence of Porphyry’s chronicle — account of the development of Greek chronographic works, see Clarke 2008: 56–89.

## Chapter 2, note 76

Of these two early Olympiad chroniclers, Philochorus wrote probably in the very early third century, thus before Eratosthenes. The identity of the author of the other Olympiad chronicle is problematic, however. Athenaeus calls the chronicle of Κτησικλῆς (Ctesicles) *Χρονικά* and *Χρόνοι* (*Chronica*, *Chronoi*: on these titles, see Appendix 1; *FgrHist*, 245 F 1–2), but Diogenes Laërtius calls the chronicle of Στησικλείδης ὁ Ἀθηναῖος (Stesiclides the Athenian) *Ἀρχόντων καὶ Ὀλυμπιονικῶν ἀναγραφὴ* (*Register of Archons and Olympic Victors*; *FgrHist*, 245 F 3). As strange as it may seem, it is believed that these are in fact the same work by the same author, the name of the former belonging to the title of the latter: see Christesen 2007: 308–09. The problem is that while this identification is certainly possible, assuming generalization and corruption on the part of Athenaeus and Diogenes respectively, there is no reason to identify these two authors or their works other than the rough similarities of their names. Stesiclides could be of any

date after 360 BC, the only date quoted from his work, while Ctesicles wrote later than the death of Eumenes II of Pergamon in 241 BC, an event he mentioned in the third book of his chronicle.

## Chapter 2, note 78

Although Möller 2004: 178–80 and Möller 2005 have recently argued that it was Eratosthenes who first synchronized the first Olympiad with the equivalent of our 776 BC, Christesen 2007: 146–57, 491–504 attributes that synchronism to Hippias of Elis. Indeed, Eratosthenes' redating of Lycurgus, one of the supposed founders of the games, to 884 BC almost guarantees that he did not introduce the 776 synchronism (see Christesen 2007: 151–56, 173). Others have attributed the synchronism to Timaeus. Whoever first proposed the synchronism, it was certainly Eratosthenes who gave this date and that of the fall of Troy their later fundamental historiographical importance as fixed points by accepting them as the dividing lines between myth and history (see Feeney 2007: 19, 84–85, 96).

## Chapter 2, note 85

Attentive readers will have noticed a difference between the dates of 2060 and 2090 BC that we offer for the beginning of Castor's Assyrian and Sicyonian king lists and the accepted date of 2123 that one finds in Jacoby (*FgrHist*, 250 1d and 2 (= vol. IIB text, pp. 1133 and 1135)) and hence elsewhere. That is because the latter date derives from Schwartz 1894–95, which is incorrect. This is not the place for a detailed explanation, but the problem and the correction are easily demonstrated. Castor's Assyrian, Sicyonian, Argive, and Athenian king lists are preserved in a variety of witnesses to Eusebius's *Chronographia*, and Eusebius used Castor's lists to construct the *fila regnorum* for these kingdoms in the *Chronici canones*. In each list, Castor marked the rulers during whose reigns the capture of Troy occurred. It is clear from his Argive and Athenian lists that he followed Eratosthenes' date for the capture of Troy (1184–1183 BC; see Huxley 1982: 184–86 and *FgrHist*, vol. IIB text, pp. 1138–39, 1141, as well as *FgrHistK*, 815–16). However, Jacoby's dates for the Assyrian and Sicyonian kings during whose reigns Troy was captured are 1248–1217 (Teutamus/Tautanes) and 1243–1213 (Polyphides; *FgrHist*, pp. 1134 and 1136). The most recent explanation for this inconsistency among Castor's various lists is that Eusebius obtained Castor's Assyrian and Sicyonian lists through an intermediary, Porphyry's chronicle, that altered the

synchronism with the Trojan war (Mosshammer 1979: 145–46 and 334 n. 31; cf. Schwartz 1894–95: 6–8 and *FgrHistK*, 817–21). But this must be rejected on the grounds that Porphyry's chronicle never existed: Croke 1983b and Janiszewski 2006: 403–11. If we follow Castor's stated figures for the number of years between the first Olympiad and the death of the last king in each list, we see an almost exact correlation with Eusebius's synchronisms in the *Canones*, where the capture of Troy does indeed occur during the reigns of Tautanes and Polyphides (1210–1180 and 1206–1175). Counting backwards from the capture of Troy gives us the dates that we have offered in the text above.

## Chapter 2, note 87

Four supposed chroniclers/chronicles are not considered here. Thrasyllus and Polybius were writers of the late Hellenistic or early imperial period (*FgrHist*, 253 (with Clarke 2008: 88–89) and 254), but nothing is known about them apart from their names (Jacoby identifies the latter with Claudius's famous freedman, but that is unlikely). Williams's commentary and biographical essay in *BNJ*, 253 is the most comprehensive account of Thrasyllus.

Thallus is often considered to have been an Olympiad chronicler because his work is listed by Eusebius in the *Chronographia* among those of other Olympiad chroniclers and he was said by Africanus to have taken care with Olympiads (*Chronographiae*, F 34.16–19), but it is not certain that he wrote a chronicle: since the work was called Ἱστορίαι (*Histories*), he may simply have written an epitome history (Clarke 2008: 73 n. 74). Because of this uncertainty, he is not considered here. For the question of his date, see Appendix 7.3 above. See also *FgrHist/BNJ*, 256 (Garstad), with *FgrHistK*, 835–37, Holladay 1983: 343–69 (though Thallus was not a Jew: see Christesen 2007: 323–24 and the biographical essay of Garstad, *BNJ*, 256), and Christesen 2007: 322–26, 434–36.

Likewise, the famous 'Pergamene chronicle' (*FgrHist*, 506), three small fragments of a historical inscription from the second century AD that narrate events from the fourth and second centuries BC, is not discussed here. Because there is no evidence for any sort of chronological apparatus in the three fragments (translated in Burstein 1985: 107), it may just have been an epitome of Pergamene history.

## Chapter 3, note 52

There are two other writers who were probably early apologetic chronographers as well. The earliest would seem to be Cassian, or perhaps Julius Cassian, the famous

Encratist heretic, if the two references in Clement are in fact to the same man (*Stromata*, 1. 21. 101. 2 and 3. 13–14, 17). The first book of Cassian's *Exegetica* is cited along with Tatian, *Oratio ad Graecos*, to support the argument that Moses and Hebrew wisdom were older than Greek thinkers and philosophy. Eusebius took Cassian's words to mean that he had composed a χρονογραφία (chronological analysis or reckoning), which may be true but if so only within the context of another exegetical work not as a stand-alone chronicle (*HE*, 6. 13. 7; see 'Appendix 1, note 21' below, p. 380). If Cassian is Julius Cassian, he would date to the third or fourth quarter of the second century. See Milikowsky 2007: 121–22. Holladay (1983: 134–35, 155–56) rightly discounts another supposed 'fragment' of Cassian.

There is also a certain Judas, who is said by Eusebius to have written a work on Daniel's seventy weeks of years (*HE*, 6. 7). It was written with the intention of determining the date of the arrival of the Antichrist and included a χρονογραφία (chronological analysis) that went down to the tenth year of Septimius Severus (202–03). Jacoby, under the influence of a misinterpretation in Jerome's *De uiris illustribus*, 52 (see 'Appendix 1, note 21' below, p. 380), believed that the term 'chronographia' referred to the title of a separate work (*FgrHist*, 261 and *RE*, 1. IX. 2, 2461; followed by Frakes in *BNJ*, 261), rather than the chronological argument of the treatise on Daniel, which by this time had become, as we shall see below, a fundamental component of these apologetics. One can still find secondary literature citing Cassian and Judas as full-blown Christian chroniclers like Africanus or Eusebius: Weiß 2010: 35–36.

### Chapter 3, note 73

The controversy over who 'Hippolytus' was and what he wrote began with Nautin 1947, who argued that the surviving *opera* of Hippolytus were the work of two authors, a Roman named Josephus and an easterner named Hippolytus. This proposal was debated in a series of bitter exchanges between Nautin and Richard from 1950 to 1955, which then became the springboard for many further studies and analyses. The dust has by no means settled, but it does look as though scholarly consensus is moving towards an acceptance of the essential part of Nautin's argument: the surviving works now attributed to 'Hippolytus of Rome' represent the work of more than one author, and the identity of this Hippolytus is a conflation of Late Roman and Byzantine mistakes and assumptions. The following provide the best recent overviews: Nautin 1961: 177–207; *Ricerche su Ippolito* 1977; Marcovich 1986: 8–17; *Nuove ricerche su Ippolito* 1989; Brent 1995: 1–367; Cerrato 2002: 1–123; Andrei 2006; Andrei 2007; and Mosshammer 2008: 118–21. Cf. also the

varying accounts in di Berardino 1992, I, 383–85 (Nautin); Cross and Livingstone 2005, 778–79 (uncredited); and Döpp and Geerlings 2000, 287–89 (Suchla).

The arguments linking the/a ‘Hippolytus’ (whoever he was) and the *Συναγωγὴ χρόνων*/*Liber generationis* can be convoluted and this is not the place to rehearse them in detail, but a short analysis of the major arguments is enough to remove any doubt of there being a connection. The literature is voluminous, but for some old and recent views, see Mommsen 1850: 594–98 and Mommsen 1892: 73, 84–86 (whose authority still sways modern interpretation), Bauer 1905: 140–62, Brent 1995: 270–99, and Marcovich 1986: 12–13 (and n. 21 with more recent bibliography).

First of all, there is no good evidence that Hippolytus ever wrote a chronicle. An acephalous epigraphic list of thirteen titles assumed to be the works of Hippolytus includes the title *Χρονικῶν* ‘(A book of) chronicles’. This list was found inscribed on the back of the chair of a broken statue of a seated female figure found in Rome in 1551 and it can be dated palaeographically to the first half of the third century, though the statue itself is second-century (Guarducci 1978: 535–45, esp. pp. 542–43; photos of the statue and the inscriptions can be found in the plates printed in Brent 1995). Hippolytus’s name, however, appears nowhere on the statue and there is nothing in the list itself to connect it with Hippolytus, particularly since none of the titles matches those given in the lists of Hippolytus’s works presented by Eusebius in his *Historia ecclesiastica* (6. 22) or Jerome in his *De uiris illustribus* (61), except for a work on the date of Easter, which is hardly surprising for the third century, a time when there was much interest in trying to establish a system separate from that of the Jewish Passover (Mosshammer 2008: 46–55, 109–61). However, the titles are not the same: Eusebius: *Περὶ τοῦ πάσχα* (*On Easter*); statue: *Ἀπόδειξις χρόνων τοῦ πάσχα καὶ τὰ ἐν τῷ πίνακι* (*A Demonstration of the Dates for Easter and that which is in the Table*, a reference, one supposes, to the historical content of the associated inscribed Easter table (both the *ἀπόδειξις* and the *τὰ* are nominative): see below). Neither Eusebius nor Jerome says anything about a chronicle.

Now the left- and right-hand sides of the statue’s chair contain a sixteen-year table of Paschal full moons and a 112-year Easter table (seven columns of sixteen years) respectively. This is believed to be the work of Hippolytus on the basis of its sixteen-year cycle (used by Hippolytus: Eusebius, *HE*, 6. 22) and its starting date, the first year of Severus Alexander, 222. However, Eusebius says that Hippolytus continued his Easter cycle down to 222 (‘ἐπὶ τὸ πρῶτον ἔτος αὐτοκράτορος Ἀλεξάνδρου’, ‘to the first year of the Emperor Alexander’), not that it began in that year. As a result, any cycle that continued his would therefore begin in 223.

Furthermore, Mosshammer shows that the epigraphic Easter cycle seems to continue Demetrius's eight-year cycle, which began in 214 and would therefore have ended in 221 (2008: 116, 122–24). As described by Eusebius, Hippolytus's cycle would have run from 207 to 222 and could thus have had no connection to Demetrius's cycle. But more important, a sixteen-year cycle seems to have been the standard cycle in use in Rome throughout the third century (Mosshammer 2008: 109–29, 238–39), so we would expect any Easter table from this period to have been constructed in this format. It is not as if Hippolytus himself was the only one who used it. Thus, the presence of a sixteen-year Easter cycle on the statue does not identify the works in the list as Hippolytan, though the apparent reference to the table and its contents in the list of titles (the ἀπόδειξις and the τὰ ἐν τῷ πίνακι) does suggest a link between these two works.

There are to our knowledge only two references to a chronicle (χρονικόν, χρονικά) of Hippolytus and both are very late (eighth- and ninth-century) and occur in very dubious contexts: the Παραστάσεις σύντομοι χρονικάί 6, 7 (= Ps-Codinus, *Patria Constantinopoleos*, 93) and Χρονογραφείον σύντομον (pp. 65. 43–44 and 66. 12–13). More important is the fact that no one else — not even Eusebius or Syncellus, who have much to say about their predecessors, or Jerome, who can add to Eusebius's list of titles — makes any mention of a chronicle by Hippolytus. The only reference Eusebius makes with respect to Hippolytus and chronography is in *HE* 6. 22, where he says that Hippolytus's work contained a 'τῶν χρόνων ἀναγραφὴ', a 'register of dates', to the first year of Alexander, which in the context is clearly not a chronicle but a list of dates for Easter (and perhaps the associated epacts and weekdays) as one would expect from such a work. That Eusebius, Jerome, and Syncellus were unaware of any chronicle written by Hippolytus is a serious argument against its existence and the massive influence that is now attributed to it in the development of the Christian chronicle.

But even if we were to admit that a/the 'Hippolytus' did write a chronicle, there is no evidence that the surviving *Συναγωγὴ χρόνων*/*Liber generationis* is that work. Certainly nothing of what 'Hippolytus's' chronicle is cited for in the two late works noted above has any parallel in the extant versions of the *Συναγωγὴ χρόνων*/*Lib. gen.*, and none of the translators or scribes of the surviving manuscripts had any inkling that this work had any connection to Hippolytus. In fact, the major clues for a connection between the surviving *Συναγωγὴ χρόνων*/*Lib. gen.* and Hippolytus are surprisingly weak and three can be dealt with quickly: (1) the date of the conclusion of the *Συναγωγὴ χρόνων*/*Lib. gen.*, 235, falls within Hippolytus's supposed lifetime ('Hippolytus of Rome' is said to have died in c. 236); (2) Hippolytus wrote in Greek and the *Συναγωγὴ χρόνων*/*Lib. gen.* was

written in Greek; and (3) the *Συναγωγή χρόνων/Lib. gen.* accepts Hippolytus's date of AM 5500 for the birth of Christ (*Lib. gen. II*, § 148; Mommsen 1892: 131). The first two amount to nothing more than coincidence, and we have seen above (pp. 114–16) how common the occurrence of the year 5500 for the birth of Christ became after it was first published by Hippolytus in his commentary on Daniel in c. 204: Julius Africanus was already advocating it strongly in his *Chronographiae* of 221. However, the more accurate *Lib. gen. I* tradition (§§ 305–15; Mommsen 1892: 130–31) implies a date of AM 5502, by either addition or subtraction of the figures provided (the date itself is not stated), so there is a real contradiction between the two traditions. Syncellus claims that his details for the time of the birth of Christ are dependent on a tradition that came down from Annianus, Maximus, and 'Hippolytos, the blessed apostle, archbishop of Rome, and holy martyr' (*Ecl. chron.*, pp. 381. 23–382. 1 = Adler and Tuffin 2002: 455), but once again there is nothing in the *Συναγωγή χρόνων/Lib. gen.* that parallels anything in Syncellus, not even his year for the birth of Christ, which is AM 5501.

Some have also seen a link between the chronological chapters 30–31 of book ten of a work entitled *Ὁ κατὰ πασῶν αἱρέσεων ἑλεγχος (Refutatio omnium haeresium)*, attributed to Hippolytus (again, not unproblematically, since the manuscripts claim (falsely) that it was written by Origen). The chronological discussion of the Old Testament and two references there to 'ἕτεροι βίβλοι', 'my other books' (10. 30. 1 and 5, Marcovich 1986: 405, 406) are taken to be references to the *Συναγωγή χρόνων/Lib. gen.* Unfortunately, only the latter, a reference to the names of the seventy-two nations that arose from the three sons of Noah (as counted in Genesis 10), has any relationship to anything in the *Συναγωγή χρόνων/Lib. gen.* This and the other very general parallels of the *Refutatio* prove little more than a common knowledge of the Old Testament and its chronologies, perhaps common written sources, but hardly common authorship. As we have seen in Chapter 3, such calculations and chronologies were hardly unusual in the second quarter of the third century.

The 112-year Easter table on the chair of the statue described above includes a number of references to events and the names of individuals from the Old Testament as well as the birth and Passion of Christ, each attributed to a certain day in the cycle (Guarducci 1978: 538–42; Mosshammer 2008: 123, where 'j' should be one line lower). It is therefore possible to calculate the underlying chronology between the events/individuals. Most of these same events and names with the number of years between them stated explicitly appear in a short *supputatio* found in the *Lib. gen.*, where it becomes obvious that this is an accounting of Passovers noted in the Old Testament (Mommsen 1892: 130–31). The similarities between

the chronologies of *Lib. gen. I* and the statue are claimed to prove common authorship by Hippolytus:

	<i>Lib. gen. I</i>	Statue	<i>Lib. gen. II</i>
Exodus to Joshua	41	41	31 <sup>†</sup>
Joshua to Hezekiah	864*	865	864
Hezekiah to Josiah	114	113	115
Josiah to Ezra	108	107	111
Ezra to birth of Christ	563	563	562
Birth of Christ to Passion	30	30	-

<sup>†</sup> The manuscript reports '531' but the total shows that 31 is the correct figure

\* The manuscripts report '444' but the total and *Lib. gen. II* show that 864 is the correct figure

These figures are indeed very close, but not identical, which proves nothing more than a common source (which would also be the case even if they were identical). Furthermore, the Easter cycle mentions one other event not included the *supputatio* (a Passover 'in the desert', two years after the beginning of the Exodus), as well as a different chronology for all five Old Testament events dated 'according to Daniel'. A further difficulty is that the *Lib. gen. I* provides the closest figures to those of the statue, yet its figures provide the date of AM 5502 for the birth of Christ. It is only the figures of the *Lib. gen. II* that total to 5500, yet its Passover figures are quite different from the inscription.

It is claimed that there once existed an early version of the Liberian Catalogue of Roman bishops found in the *Chronograph of 354* (Mommson 1892: 73–76) that had extended only down to the episcopate of Pontianus (230–35; the first time that days of the month are noted). It is further claimed that this episcopal list was derived from the list of bishops that Hippolytus included in his chronicle as indicated by the table of contents in two manuscripts of the *Liber generationis* (BF, described above, which belong to the same textual tradition), though neither list now actually survives. But in spite of the continuing reappearance of these claims (e.g. Brent 1995: 270–99 and Williams 2005: 161–78), this argument was disproved in 1905 when Bauer first published the Greek text: its table of contents makes no mention of an episcopal list. The list of manuscripts BF was nothing but a later addition to a single Latin tradition, not a vestige of the original Greek text (the extant episcopal list in F is quite independent of and much later than the *Lib. gen.* text). Without the episcopal list, the connection between the Liberian Catalogue and Hippolytus evaporated (see Duchesne 1957: 45).

Hippolytus's name appears next to that of Julius Africanus in every account of early Christian chronography and history, and many grand theories have been built on the assumption that either he wrote a chronicle or the *Συναγωγὴ χρόνων*/*Lib.*



*gen.* is that chronicle, but the arguments linking the two were built on sand. There is no denying that the *Συναγωγή χρόνων*/*Lib. gen.* was very popular, particularly in the Latin West. It was, after all, a very basic but handy guide to the chronologies of the Old Testament. There must have been many such texts, related and unrelated, compiled by Christian and Jewish writers alike. But the most popular part of the text, the *Διαμερισμός τῆς γῆς* (*The Division of the World*), a description of the world divided according to the three sons of Noah, Shem, Ham, and Japheth, which is an updating and expansion of Genesis 10 (*Lib. gen.* I §§ 24–205 and Bauer and Helm 1955: 10–42), was almost certainly an independent work added either by the author or a later copyist, just as the *Σταδιασμός τῆς θαλάσσης* (*The Measurement of the (Mediterranean) Sea*) was a later interpolation into the surviving Greek text of the *Συναγωγή χρόνων* (for the *Diamerismos*, see von Gutschmid 1858 and 1894, Bauer and Strzykowski 1905: 92–105, Bauer 1905: 150–52, 162–242, and J. Scott 2002: 135–58, who argues for a Jewish source; for the *Stadiasmus*, see Bauer 1905: 243–76 (by Otto Cuntz) and Bauer and Helm 1955: 43–69).

And so, in spite of their modern reputations neither Hippolytus nor the *Συναγωγή χρόνων*/*Liber generationis* had any measurable influence upon the development of Christian chronography. It is for this reason that Hippolytus does not figure in this study.

## Chapter 4, note 6

There were many different dates for the foundation of Rome offered by different historians and writers. Ennius may have dated the foundation of the city to soon after 1100 BC (see Skutsch 1985: 314–15), but it is highly unlikely that he could have synchronized Eratosthenes' date for the fall of Troy with Roman history, and in view of the alternative date offered by his patron, M. Fulvius Nobilior (see below), this date seems far too early; Timaeus dated it to 813 BC (thirty-eighth year before the first Olympiad); Asinius Quadratus to 775 (Olymp. 1.1); 'nonnulli Romanorum scriptores' (according to Eusebius: Jerome, *Chron. can.*, 88<sup>8</sup>), Jerome, and Velleius Paterculus to 754 (Olymp. 6.2); Atticus, Varro, Plutarch, Eutropius, and Censorinus to 753 (Olymp. 6.3); Fulvius Nobilior (= Macrobius, *Saturnalia*, 1. 13. 21; see Rüpke 2006: 503–05, 507–08, and Skutsch 1985: 316, though the AUC date is not Varronian as Skutsch believes), the *Fasti Capitolini*, and the *Kaisergeschichte* (= Jerome, *Chron. can.*, 77<sup>c</sup>, Aurelius Victor, *Liber de caesaribus*, 1. 1, and the *Epitome de caesaribus*, 1. 1) to 752 (= Olymp. 6.4); Cn. Gellius, Cassius Hemina, Dionysius, Eusebius, and Solinus to 751 (Olymp. 7.1); Cato to 751 (432 years after the Trojan War = Olymp. 7.1, assuming Eratosthenes' date for

the fall of Troy, which is very uncertain); Polybius, Lutatius, Nepos, and Diodorus to 750 (Olymp. 7.2); Pictor to 747 (Olymp. 8.1); Ausonius to 739 (see Burgess 2011: 2–3); and Cincius Alimentus to 728 (Olymp. 12.4), all on the assumption that, where only Olympiad dates are given, the Olympiads are synchronized accurately from the first games in the summer of 776.

Olympiads were, however, often synchronized with the civic year in which the games actually fell (see Appendix 7.3, note 15, above). This would make Olymp. 1.1 the year 777–776 BC by the Macedonian civic calendar (used throughout the East and beginning in the autumn) or 776 according to the Roman civic calendar (beginning on 1 January). This would introduce the possibility of any Olympiad's being one year earlier or later than the dates given: 21 April 753 (753–752 = 1 AUC) is Olymp. 6.3 if the Olympiad is calculated from July 776 (6.3 = July 754 – July 753), but Olymp. 6.4 if calculated according to a civic year. Likewise 21 April of Olymp. 6.3 is 753 if the Olympiad is calculated from July 776, but 754 if calculated from a civic year. It is on this basis that it has been suggested that the foundation date of Dionysius, at least, actually belongs in 752, which is probably correct (see Samuel 1972: 251–52). We suspect that the cluster of dates between 754 and 750 is a result of multiple such conversions between AUC and variant Olympiad chronologies based on 754 and 750, the difference between the two no doubt being the discrepancy that necessitated the invention of the four dictator years (see Chapter 2, note 7). It is also likely that later citations of pre-first-century historians involving references to the fall of Troy or Olympiads are not in fact original, but later synchronisms: as we saw in the last chapter, accurate synchronisms between Roman and Greek history did not appear until the first century BC. Despite entitling his history *Ab urbe condita*, Livy gives no actual foundation date and was clearly unconcerned to work one out, though two of his sources assumed dates of 753 and 751. For this, see Appendix 8 below.

After the reign of Augustus, however, the generally (though not universally) accepted date was 753 BC. The emperor Claudius celebrated Rome's eight-hundredth anniversary games in AD 47, which was AUC 800 calculated from 753 BC, but Philip I celebrated the millennial anniversary in April 248, which would suggest it was calculated from 752. However, coins of Pacatianus, a usurper whose brief uprising must date to the middle of 248 marks that year as 'ROMAE AETER AN MILL ET PRIMO' ('Year 1001 of Eternal Rome'; Mattingly, Sydenham, and Sutherland 1949: no. 6, p. 105). If we can trust that Pacatianus knew what anniversary the celebrations in Rome actually marked, Philip was therefore celebrating the end of the one thousandth year — Rome's one thousandth birthday — not its beginning. For the date of Pacatianus, see *RE Suppl.*, IX, 567–68 (Mócsy); *RE*,

2. VIII. 2, 2175, 2177–78 (Saria); and Huttner 2008: 199–200. No local coins from Viminacium, the mint Pacatianus employed for his coinage, survive attesting to year ten of the provincial era, which began on 1 July 248. This indicates that Pacatianus had taken control of the mint at some point prior to 1 July, before any of that year's coins could be minted. Decius seems to have been proclaimed by the troops as early as May of 249, which narrows the parameters within which we locate Pacatianus's reign at the other end (Birley 1998: 74 and Huttner 2008: 202).

These coins of Pacatianus are often said to be modern forgeries (usually with reference to Birley 1991: 410 or Birley 1998: 67 n. 85), but three further specimens are extant in addition to the two mentioned by Birley, one in the Narodni Museum in Belgrade and two undoubtedly authentic specimens that have appeared recently in the coin trade: Leu 18 lot 374 (5 May 1977) = Münzen & Medaillen 66 lot 805 (22–23 Oct. 1984) and H. D. Rauch 72 lot 780 (20 September 2003) = Triton VII lot 1018 (12 January 2004). We owe this information to Curtis Clay.

The date of Antoninus Pius's secular games is unattested, but variously placed in 147 or 148 in the modern literature, although the former should be correct.

Only two coins use an AUC date: an aureus of Hadrian (Mattingly and Sydenham 1926: no. 144, p. 357, 'ANN DCCCLXXIII NAT VRB' = AUC 874 = AD 121 if calculated from 753, but the coin cannot be independently dated) and the antoninianus of Pacatianus discussed above.

On the whole question of the date of the foundation, see Samuel 1972: 250–53, which is somewhat confused and outdated especially with regard to Eusebius and Jerome, and Werner 1963, which remains the best study.

## Chapter 4, note 19

A variety of alternative dates has been proposed for the construction of the temple of Hercules of the Muses, and they depend on whether or not one accepts the evidence of Eumenius (*Panegyricus Latinus*, 9 (4). 7. 3, of c. AD 297/98). He certainly knows a great deal about the temple and Fulvius, in spite of his late date, so one should not lightly dismiss his testimony that Fulvius built the temple 'ex pecunia censoria', thus in 179–178 BC. That date, however, would place the construction more than ten years after his victories, which does seem excessive, even without Cicero's 'Fulvius non dubitavit Martis manubias Musis consecrare' (*Pro Archia*, 27). More important, Livy lists Fulvius's censorial expenditures and does not include this famous temple (40. 51. 6), just a portico for a temple of Hercules ('porticum [...] ad fanum Herculis'). That has prompted some to suggest that the portico was all Fulvius ever built, an addition to an already existing temple of

Hercules, in which he deposited his spoils. Briscoe 2008: 545–46, however, argues no doubt rightly that Livy's temple is in fact a completely different temple of Hercules. As a result, it seems safer to suggest an earlier date for the construction of the temple itself, *c.* 186–183, after the triumph of 187 and the votive games in 186 (Gratwick 1982: 65; Richardson 1992: 187) and that Eumenius has confused this temple with the portico rebuilt while Fulvius was censor. The date of 184 BC has recently been suggested (Gratwick 1982: 65 and Feeney 2007: 143–44) because it was exactly one thousand years after Eratosthenes' date for the fall of Troy, but as we saw in Chapter 2, at the beginning of the second century BC it would have been impossible for any Roman to have synchronized Eratosthenes' data in any meaningful way with Roman chronology. The date one assigns to the construction of the temple to Hercules also affects the date at which Ennius originally ended his *Annales*, because that poem appears to have concluded with the construction of the temple (see Gratwick 1982: 64–65 and Feeney 2007: 66, but cf. Zetzel 2007: 13–14). At Octavian's urging (Suetonius, *Augustus*, 29. 5), his stepfather L. Marcus Philippus rebuilt the temple in 29 BC and surrounded it with a new or larger portico (see Coarelli 1997: 473–76).

#### Chapter 4, note 21

It must be admitted that much of the above reconstruction of the nature of Fulvius's fasti is hypothetical: there is no explicit evidence that the calendar commentary was accompanied by a calendar, that consular fasti were associated with that calendar, or that any of this was painted or inscribed on the interior or exterior walls of the temple, rather than just written on a codex and deposited there (see Wiseman 1979: 15 n. 42 and Northwood 2007: 108–09 among others). But in light of all later evidence for such works — especially the painted Fasti Antiates maiores, which as far as anyone can tell from the surviving evidence is a continuation of Fulvius's work, and the inscribed Fasti Praenestini (both calendrical and consular) of Verrius Flaccus, which has been interpreted as an updated and expanded version of Fulvius's work — a painted dedication-commentary, calendar, and fasti is the most plausible and logical hypothesis. Macrobius, *Saturnalia*, 1. 12. 16 uses the verb *ponere* ('Fulvius Nobilior in fastis quos in aede Herculis musarum posuit'), which certainly allows this meaning (i.e. 'dedicated') and is not as restrictive as is often implied by some modern scholars ('placed', 'set'; see Rüpke 2006: 491–93), and he would not have used the word 'fasti' to describe a mere calendar commentary ('fasti' is the word he uses to describe Flaccus's Fasti Praenestini, a calendar/calendar commentary/fasti combination, which is discussed below

(*Saturnalia*, 1. 12. 30)). For a reconstruction of the temple, based on the Severan *Forma urbis Romae*, which includes Nobilior's calendar decorating the twelve niches that flank the extended base of the temple (thus implying an inscribed text), see Coarelli 1997: 479–82.

## Chapter 4, note 23

Ennius appears to have used the title *Annales* long before any of the so-called 'annalists' (the Roman annalistic historians of the late republic) existed (Verbrughe 1989: 196 n. 12; cf. Verbrughe 1989: 196; Zetzel 2007: 12 n. 60 for doubt about Ennius's original title; but cf. Elliott 2010: 158 n. 5). The surprise of Gildenhard 2003: 93–94, 97–102 at Ennius's 'non-annalistic' style is therefore ill founded. The poet wrote before any pejorative sense of the 'annalistic' style had developed (on which see Appendix 2) and long before there is any evidence for the title *Annales maximi* (see Volume II for the hypothesis that these were a late historiographical development). The use of the term for a history certainly appears to be his invention. He perhaps saw it as a Latin equivalent of the Greek ὥροι, which were discussed in Chapter 2. Although he certainly could not have made a reference to every year in the poem, his title implied that he was much more 'annalistic' (i.e. 'year by year') in his account of Roman history than his predecessors Q. Fabius Pictor and L. Cincius Alimentus had been (though see Northwood 2007 for a spirited exposé of how little we really know about Pictor). It would have been Fulvius's researches into the consuls and censors that gave Ennius the chronological basis on which to make his 'year by year' claim (see Chapter 4, note 24).

## Chapter 6, note 95

Those who wish to pursue the extensive and fascinating Syriac tradition may consult Chabot 1921; Witakowski 1987, esp. pp. 76–89; Hoyland 1991; Palmer 1993 (introductions to and translations of many of the texts noted below); Witakowski 1996; and most recently Debié 2009, with important individual chapter bibliographies and a bibliography of Syriac historiographical texts (pp. 211–17). Information on the individual chronicles noted following this note in Chapter 6 can be located in Karayannopoulos and Weiß 1982 and Ortiz de Urbina 1958. The major texts involved are the *Chronicon Edessenum* (extends to the year 540, but is probably mid- to late sixth century; Latin translation in *Chron. min.* 1, CSCO, 2, SS 2: SS 3. 4, versio (Leuven, 1903; repr. 1955), pp. 3–11; Syriac text in *Chron. min.* 1,

CSCO, 1, SS 1: SS 3. 4, textus (Leuven, 1903; repr. 1955), pp. 1–13; see also Hallier 1892 and Witakowski 1984–86); the anonymous *Chronicle to the Year 724*, also known as the *Liber Chalipharum* (c. 640), a composite chronicle compiled from many different Syriac chronicle sources listed under seven different ‘rubrics’ or headings, each from a different source (rubric six alone is made up of nine different chronicle fragments), including the famous epitome of Eusebius’s *Chronici canones* (rubric four), to which was added almost a century later a list of caliphs from the time of Mohammad to c. 724, hence the modern titles (Latin trans. in CSCO, 4, SS 4: SS 3. 4, versio (Leuven, 1904; repr. 1955), pp. 63–119; Syriac text in CSCO, 3, SS 3: SS 3. 4, textus (Leuven, 1904; repr. 1955), pp. 77–155); the *Melkite Chronicle* (after 642, before c. 680; ed. by Halleux 1978); the *Maronite Chronicle* (after 664; Latin trans. in CSCO, 4, SS 4: SS 3. 4, versio (Leuven, 1904; repr. 1955), pp. 37–57; Syriac text in CSCO, 3, SS 3: SS 3. 4, textus (Leuven, 1904; repr. 1955), pp. 43–74); the *Chronicle* of Jacob of Edessa (a direct continuation of Eusebius to 692, or 631 as extant, later continued to 710; Latin trans. in CSCO, 6, SS 6: SS 3. 4, versio (Leuven, 1907; repr. 1955), pp. 199–255; Syriac text in CSCO, 5, SS 5: SS 3. 4, textus (Leuven, 1905; repr. 1955), pp. 261–327); the *Chronicle* of Ps-Dionysius of Tel-Mahre, more frequently now called the *Chronicle of Zuqnin* (775; Latin trans. in CSCO, 121: SS 3. 1, versio (Leuven, 1949) and English trans. of the third part in Witakowski 1996 and third and fourth parts by Harrak 1999; Syriac text in CSCO, 91, SS 43: SS 3. 1, textus (Leuven, 1927; repr. 1953); the *Chronicle to the Year 819* (ninth-century; Latin trans. in CSCO, 109, SS 56: SS 3. 14, versio (Leuven, 1937; repr. 1952), pp. 1–16; Syriac text in CSCO, 81, SS 36: SS 3. 14, textus (Leuven, 1920; repr. 1953), pp. 3–22); the *Chronicle to the Year 846* (ninth-century; Latin trans. in CSCO, 109, SS 56: SS 3. 14, versio (Leuven, 1937; repr. 1952), pp. 17–266; Syriac text in CSCO, 81, SS 36: SS 3. 14, textus (Leuven, 1920; repr. 1953), pp. 26–341); the *Chronographia* of Elias Bar Shinaya (mid-eleventh-century; Latin trans. in CSCO, 63\*, SS 23: SS 3. 7, versio (Leuven, 1910; repr. 1954) and CSCO, 63\*\*, SS 24: SS 3. 8, versio (Leuven, 1910; repr. 1954); Syriac and Arabic text in CSCO, 62\*, SS 21: SS 3. 7, textus (Leuven, 1910; repr. 1954) and CSCO, 62\*\*, SS 22: SS 3. 8, textus (Leuven, 1909; repr. 1954)); the *Chronicle* of Michael the Syrian (twelfth-century; ed. by Chabot 1899–1924); the *Chronicle to the Year 1234* (thirteenth-century; Latin trans. in CSCO, 109, SS 56: SS 3. 14, versio (Leuven, 1937; repr. 1952), pp. 17–266; Syriac text in CSCO, 81, SS 36: SS 3. 14, textus (Leuven, 1920; repr. 1953), pp. 26–341); and finally the bipartite *Chronicon* of Bar Hebraeus (more properly Bar Hebroyo; mid-thirteenth-century, and the only Syriac chronicle known in multiple manuscripts; ed. by Abbeloos and Lamy 1872–77; Budge 1932). The point of greatest interest to us here is that, as

in Ireland of all places, the Syriac world had a continuous history of chronicling that preserved the genre's essential chronographic interests and paratactic style, from the moment of the genre's local inception all the way into the early modern period.

### Chapter 6, note 147

The seventh-century text of Fredegar included an interpolated version of the *Liber generationis*, a *supputatio* from Adam to Sigebert II (613), a list of popes to the accession of Theodore (642), a short excerpt from Isidore on the six days of Creation, an interpolated epitome of Eusebius-Jerome, an interpolated epitome of Hydatius, very substantial anonymous chapters on Theoderic the Great and Justinian (2. 57–60 and 62, respectively, occupying ten pages of Krusch's edition, and based on no known source: see Hellmann 1934), an interpolated epitome of Gregory of Tours's *Historiae* 1–6, and ninety original chapters. These latter were organized roughly by regnal years, running from the twenty-fourth year of Guntram of Burgundy (584) to the death of the Burgundian majordomo Flaochad (642). The earliest manuscript contains a version of Isidore's chronicle epitome, though this does not appear to have been integral to the Fredegar compilation (see Goffart 1963, R. Collins 1996: 87, and R. Collins 2007: 36–37).

### Chapter 6, note 148

Krusch's standard edition divides the Fredegar material into four numbered books followed by *continuationes*, but these correspond to the evidence for numeration in none of the manuscript families: the numeration of the seventh-century compilation remains almost totally obscure, while the eighth-century text always circulated in three books which correspond to neither the modern edition nor any hypothetical seventh-century organization. In this traditional view, any eighth-century manuscript that contains the ninety chapters from 584–642 is merely a late recension of the seventh-century 'Fredegar' original, rather than a separate work, making it possible to speak of eighth-century continuations by as few as two and as many as five hands. (Unfortunately for the stemmatics, the oldest manuscript to contain those chapters, Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, MS lat. 10910, dates to 714/15 and was put together by a monk Lucerius, but it is not the archetype for any other extant manuscript, but rather a relative of the archetype that had already been interpolated with the whole of Isidore's epitome; see Hellmann 1934, Goffart 1963, and R. Collins 2007: 56–59.) Alternatively, one can follow Collins and speak of a new

eighth-century *Historia uel Gesta Francorum* that includes some but not all of the material in the seventh-century Fredegar compilation, along with the anonymous Neustrian *Liber historiae Francorum* and new material running down to 768.

## Chapter 6, note 149

There is no manuscript evidence for multiple eighth-century continuators and no internal evidence for breaks in compilation save for the colophon of the year 751, which identifies the provenance of the compilation. Rather than representing a series of heterogeneous continuations, all the manuscripts of the eighth-century compilation, which include historical material from 642 to 768, replace parts of the seventh-century compilation with other works that it did not originally contain and reorder that material into three books. The new book one includes the *De cursu temporum* of Julius Hilarianus, where the *Liber generationis* had stood in the seventh-century Fredegar compilation, and the seventh-century Fredegarian epitome of Jerome and Hydatius, to which it adds a new section in the shape of a fifth- or sixth-century Latin work on the fall of Troy designed to underscore the Trojan origins of the Franks (entitled *Historia Daretis Frigii de origine Francorum* and related to, but not identical with, the *Historia de excidio Troiae*, also attributed to Dares the Phrygian, which proliferated in western Europe from the tenth century onwards). The new book two isolates the same epitome of Gregory of Tours's books one to six as found in the seventh-century compilation. Book three contains the ninety chapters of 'Fredegar' material from 584–642, taken from a class of manuscripts that circulated only in south-western Germany and the region of Lake Constance, along with new material from 642–768, but showing no awareness of any break at 642.

## Appendix 1, note 9

The only known earlier use of the word χρονικά as a title seems to be the Χρονικά πραξίδια of Timaeus, the famous late fourth- to early third-century historian. The *Suda* (Tau 602, s.v. Τίμαιος) gives the title of this work as Ὀλυμπιονίκαι ἤτοι Χρονικά πραξίδια. Πραξίδια (also spelled πραξεῖδια without the itacism) is the diminutive of the noun πράξις ('action, doing') and appears for the most part only in Byzantine grammars and etymologies. Jacoby (*FgrHist*, 566 T 1 and *FgrHistK*, 546) emended the noun to πραξιδικά, which does not help since that is a hapax legomenon in Greek invented from the title of a work by the second-century BC



Latin poet Accius (only referred to by Pliny the Elder, *Historia naturalis*, 18. 55. 200: ‘Attius in Praxidica’). Jacoby thinks it is a Hellenistic term for ‘hand-book’, but Pliny cites Accius for an agricultural matter and ‘Praxidica’ in this context would seem to be related to another name for Persephone (Πραξιδική), as we know from the Orphic hymn 29. 5. Some think Accius’s treatise is the same work as one cited by Aulus Gellius (*NA*, 20. 3. 3) under the title *Pragmatica*, that being a Latin translation of the Greek title cited by Pliny. Whatever the work of Accius was, for Timaeus it is best to stick with the manuscript reading. The work seems to have been the earliest careful attempt to correlate the standard chronological systems of the Greek world: Spartan ephors and kings, Athenian archons, priestesses of Argos, and Olympic victors are those that are specifically mentioned by Polybius (*FgrHist*, 566 T 10). See *FgrHist*, F 125–28 and Christesen 2007: 277–89, esp. pp. 277–79, who treats πραξιδικα [*sic*] as the manuscript reading and as an adjective rather than a noun. The title therefore probably means something like ‘Minor Events Relating to Chronology’, the diminutive emphasizing the (still held) belief that such matters as the names of the archons or the sequence of Olympic victors are of little historical importance for the ‘big picture’. (This belittling of detailed chronology is emphasized in the quotations from Plutarch and Eunapius that we saw in ‘Chapter 1, note 11’ above, pp. 357–58.) This work may have been a chronicle but it may also have been some kind of technical treatise that involved the establishment of chronology. Almost nothing survives from it, so we shall never know. Nevertheless, its importance should not be underestimated, since it established the use of Olympiads as a reliable chronological system and thereby laid the groundwork for all later Greek chronography.

## Appendix 1, note 21

The varied vocabulary that Jerome uses for chronicles is as follows: Χρονικόν, *Ep.* 57. 5; ‘temporum liber’, *Ep.* 18A. 1 and *Onomasticon*, praef. (p. 3.13); ‘temporum canones’, *Onomasticon*, praef. (p. 3.2); ‘digestio temporum’, *Contra Rufinum*, 1. 11; ‘chronicorum canonum omnimoda historia et eorum ἐπιτομή’, *De uiris illustribus*, 81; and ‘chronicon omnimodae historiae’, *De uir. ill.*, 135. The manuscripts of his *Commentarii in Daniele*, 3. 9. 24 (line 374) are split between ‘in chronico’ and ‘in chronica’, with the latter (feminine singular) being accepted by the most recent editor (Glorie), though in view of the other early evidence for this word, this is more likely an early medieval change from ‘chronico’ (the manuscripts are eighth- or ninth-century). Jerome says in the *De uiris illustribus* that he had heard that Dexter, the son of Pacianus, had ‘carefully compiled’ (‘texuisse’) a ‘universal history’

(‘omnimoda historia’) for him, but he had not read it (*De uir. ill.*, 132). That may have been a chronicle. In that same work he uses both Greek and Latin to translate from Eusebius’s *Historia ecclesiastica*: ‘τῶν χρόνων ἀναγραφὴ’, ‘register of dates’, used by Eusebius to describe the chronological reckoning in Hippolytus’s *Περὶ τοῦ πάσχα* (*On Easter*) (*HE*, 6. 22; see ‘Chapter 3, note 73’ above, p. 368), is translated as ‘temporum canon’ (*De uir. ill.*, 61; Rufinus translates it as ‘descriptio quaedam temporum’ in his Latin translation of the *HE*); he misunderstands Eusebius when he says that Judas wrote a ‘χρονογραφία’ down to the tenth year of Septimius Severus (*De uir. ill.*, 52 = *HE*, 6. 7; see ‘Chapter 3, note 52’ above, p. 366); and he mentions the *Χρονογραφία* of Cassian, who, he says, was mentioned by Clement in his *Stromata* (*De uir. ill.*, 38 = *HE*, 6. 13. 7, though Eusebius has *χρονογραφία*; Rufinus translates it as ‘chronica’). Clement mentions no such work, and almost certainly Eusebius is referring to Cassian’s *Exegetica*, mentioned at *Stromata*, 1. 21. 101. 2, and is simply describing the work, not giving it a title, as Jerome assumed (which explains why Jerome says he could not find it). Jerome also refers to Julius Africanus and his *Chronographiae* on a number of occasions: ‘scriptor temporum’ and ‘de temporibus’, ‘temporum historiae’, and ‘tempora’ (see *Chronographiae*, T 2a, 7a, 7b, and F 93 (= *Commentarii in Daniele*, 3. 9. 24 bis)). No doubt it was these sorts of usages by Jerome that prompted the phrases used by Isidore and found in the manuscripts of his epitome: ‘temporum summa’, ‘breuis temporum’, ‘chronicorum canonum multiplex historia regnis simul ac temporibus ordinata’, ‘descriptio temporum’, ‘temporum series’, ‘expositio temporum’, ‘breuis temporum expositio’, and ‘liber de ordine temporum’ (see ‘Chapter 1, note 50’ above, pp. 359–60).

### Appendix 7.1, note 2

Christesen’s list of stated sources in the *Canones* for pre-Roman history (2007: 262, table 17) is surprisingly incomplete. A complete list of those sources noted in both the *Canones* and the *Chronographia* (passim, and not just in the source list) is as follows: Castor for the Argives (27<sup>g</sup>, 45<sup>a</sup>), Sicyonians (64<sup>a</sup>), and the Athenians (64<sup>f</sup>), as in the *Chronographia*; Manetho for the Egyptians (62.1, 121<sup>h</sup>), as in the *Chronographia*; Apollodorus for the dates of Homer (66<sup>a</sup>; 77<sup>c</sup> is an addition by Jerome) and Lycurgus (84<sup>f</sup>); Porphyry for the date of Hesiod (84<sup>c</sup>); Africanus for Jewish and Greek history (86<sup>h,k</sup>, 113<sup>a</sup>); Josephus for Jewish history (55<sup>c</sup>, 113<sup>a</sup>, 174<sup>d</sup>, 178<sup>c</sup>, 181<sup>d</sup>, 187<sup>a</sup>); Clement for the Jewish captivity (100<sup>a</sup>, 105<sup>d</sup>), the second passage repeating the quotation from the *Chronographia*; and Phlegon for the darkness at the crucifixion (174<sup>d</sup>). This full list actually serves to confirm Christesen’s

conclusion that the sources listed in the *Chronographia* were meant to cover Eusebius's entire chronicle and not just the *Chronographia*.

### Appendix 7.3, note 13

The link between this eclipse and the fourth year of Olymp. 202 explains why Eusebius's date for the crucifixion is so unusual (in fact, it is unique). Normal practice was to start from Tiberius's fifteenth year (from Luke 3. 1, where 1 Tiberius = AD 14) and add one year (following the synoptic gospels) or three years (following John) for Christ's ministry. This puts the crucifixion in March of 29 or 31 (thus 16 or 18 Tiberius). Eusebius instead puts it in 32, 19 Tiberius, thus giving Jesus a ministry of four years. (It must be remembered that Jerome 'corrects' Eusebius's date (*Chron. can.*, 174<sup>d</sup>), pushing it back to 18 Tiberius; see Burgess 2002: 26–27 n. 54.) This is justified in his *HE* 1. 10 with deliberate and gross misrepresentations of both the Gospels and Josephus (*Antiquitates Iudaicae*, 18. 2. 2). He pre-empts the obvious argument by quoting the evidence of John and the three-year ministry, as if his chronology offered three years instead of four. Such is Eusebius's method. The convoluted defence of his chronology, which never once acknowledges how unusual it is, makes it clear that Eusebius put more trust in the supposed synchronization of the eclipse and the crucifixion (and therefore Thallus and Phlegon) than he did in the Gospels or Josephus. One strongly suspects, therefore, that the entry that Eusebius quotes from 'Ἑλληνικὰ ὑπομνήματα' ('pagan records') in the *Canones* (174<sup>d</sup>) is actually from Thallus ('ὁ ἥλιος ἐξέλιπε. Βιθυνία ἐσείσωη. Νικαίας τὰ πολλὰ ἔπεσεν'; 'There was a solar eclipse. Bithynia was struck by an earthquake. Many buildings in Nicaea collapsed' = Syncellus, *Ecl. chron.*, p. 394.4–5). The wording and order of these clauses, however, show that the ultimate source of these sentences must be Phlegon, named and quoted in full by Eusebius in the same entry (= Syncellus, *Ecl. chron.*, p. 394.8–11 = Phlegon *FgrHist*, 257 F 13) and by John Philoponus (*De opificio mundi*, 2. 21, p. 254.9–13), which strengthens the hypothesis that Phlegon was Thallus's source for this event. Thallus was therefore trying to use 'science' to explain the events of the crucifixion, without knowing the date of the crucifixion or of the eclipse, but Eusebius wholeheartedly accepted his claim, in spite of the fact that Africanus, whom Eusebius had read, proved scientifically that it was impossible (*Chronographiae*, F 93. 6–13). But the author of Ps-Dionysius the Areopagite's letter to Polycarp (*Ep.* 7. 2; c. 500?) had obviously read Africanus on the eclipse as well, and Africanus's objections were grist to his mill: while referring to examples of God's power over celestial bodies in

the Old Testament (Joshua 10. 12–14, Ecclesiastes 46. 3–4, Isaiah 38. 8, II Kings 20. 9–11), he claims to have been in Heliopolis at the time of the eclipse and to have witnessed the moon jump from one side of the sky to the other, eclipse the sun, then jump back. No doubt Eusebius believed in a similar type of miracle. Philoponus accepted both Eusebius's argument for the four-year ministry and Ps-Dionysius's account of the eclipse (*De opificio mundi*, 2. 21, p. 256.8–20).

## EDITIONS AND TRANSLATIONS OF IMPORTANT TEXTS

For the rationale behind this list, see p. xiv.

Agnellus, Andreas, *Liber pontificalis ecclesiae Ravennatis: Codex pontificalis ecclesiae Ravenmatis I*, ed. by Alessandro Testi Rasponi, *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*, Raccolta degli Storici Italiani dal cinquecento al millecinquecento, 2. 3 (Bologna, 1924); also ed. by O. Holder-Egger, MGH SRLang, pp. 265–391 and Deliyannis 2006; English trans.: Deliyannis 2004

*Anonymus Matritensis: Anonymi Chronographia syntomos e codice Matritensi no. 121 nunc 4701*, ed. by Adolph Bauer, BT (Leipzig, 1909)

*Anonymus Valesianus: Excerpta Valesiana*, ed. by Jacques Moreau and Velizar Velkov, BT (Leipzig, 1968); trans. and text in Ammianus Marcellinus, *History*, III: *Books 27–31; Excerpta Valesiana*, trans. by John C. Rolfe, LCL, 331 (Cambridge, MA, 1939), pp. 530–69

Aurelius Victor, *Liber de caesaribus: Sexti Aurelii Victoris Liber de Caesaribus*, ed. by Fr. Pichlmayr and R. Gruendel, BT (Leipzig, 1970); *Liber de caesaribus of Sextus Aurelius Victor*, trans. by H. W. Bird, TTH, 17 (Liverpool, 1994)

*Breviarium Vindobonense* (= *Chronica urbis Romae*): Mommsen 1892: 141–48

Cassiodorus, chronicle: Mommsen 1894: 111–61 and Klaassen 2010

———, *Institutiones: Cassiodori senatoris Institutiones*, ed. by R. A. B. Mynors (Oxford, 1937; corr. repr., 1961)

Cedrenus, Σύνοψις ἱστοριῶν: *Georgius Cedrenus*, I, ed. by Immanuel Bekker, CSHB (Bonn, 1838)

*Chronicon Bruxellense: Anecdota Bruxellensia*, I: *Chroniques byzantines du manuscrit 11376*, ed. by Franz Cumont, Université de Gand, Recueil de travaux publiés par la faculté de philosophie et lettres, 10 (Gand, 1894)

Χρονικὸν ἐπίτομον: *Das XPONIKON EPIITOMON der Wiener Handschrift Th. Gr. Nr. XL: Text und Untersuchung*, ed. by Arthur Pusch (Jena, 1908)

*Chronicon Paschale: Chronicon Paschale*, ed. by Ludwig Dindorf, 2 vols, CSHB (Bonn, 1832) with Latin translation; English trans. (from 284) in Whitby and Whitby 1989

*Chronograph of 354*: Mommsen 1892: 15–148, with Theodor Mommsen, *CIL*, I. 1, 2nd edn (Berlin, 1893), pp. 354–79, and Degraffi 1963: 238–61 (calendar only)

Χρονογραφεῖον σύντομον: Schoene 1875: Appendix IV, pp. 63–102

*Chronographia Golenischevensis*: Bauer and Strzygowski 1905

*Chronographia Scaligeriana* (= *Barbarus Scaligeri, Excerpta Latina barbari*): Schoene 1875: Appendix VI, pp. 177–239; Mommsen 1892: 91–129, 274–85, 290–98 (first and third parts only);

- Frick 1892: lxxxiii–ccx, 184–371; and Garstad 2012: 142–311 (Frick's text with English translation and short commentary)
- Ps-Codinus, *Patria Constantinopoleos: Scriptores originum Constantinopolitanarum*, II, ed. by T. Preger (Leipzig, 1907; repr. 1975), pp. 135–289
- Constantine Manasses, *Breviarium: Breviarium historiae metricum*, ed. by Immanuel Bekker, CSHB (Bonn, 1837) with Latin translation
- Consularia Berolinensia*: Burgess and Dijkstra 2012; Hans Lietzmann, 'Ein Blatt aus einer antiken Weltchronik', in *Quantulacumque: Studies Presented to K. Lake*, ed. by Robert P. Casey, Silva Lake, and Agnes K. Lake (London, 1937), pp. 339–48, repr. in Hans Lietzmann, *Kleine Schriften*, I (Berlin, 1958), pp. 420–29
- Consularia Caesaraugustana*: Cardelle de Hartmann 2001: 3–55 and Mommsen 1894: 221–23
- Consularia Golenischevensis* (= final consularia section of *Chronographia Golenischevensis*): Bauer and Strzygowski 1905: 73–75 and Burgess and Dijkstra forthcoming
- Consularia Hafniensia* (= *Addimenta ad Prosperum Havniensia, Auctuarium Prosperi Havniense, and Continuatio Havniensis Prosperi*): Mommsen 1892: 266–71, 298–339 and Cessi 1922
- Consularia Italica*: Mommsen 1892: 251–339
- Consularia Marsiburgensia*: Bischoff and Koehler 1939
- Consularia Scaligeriana* (= final consularia section of *Chronographia Scaligeriana*): Schoene 1875: Appendix VI, pp. 225–39; Frick 1892: 330–71; Mommsen 1892: 274–85, 290–98; and Garstad 2012: 272–311 (Frick's text with English translation and short commentary)
- Consularia Vindobonensia* (= *Fasti Vindobonenses*): Mommsen 1892: 263–64, 274–334; Frick 1892: 375–418; and Cessi 1916
- Cornelius Nepos, *Chronica*: HRR, II, 25–26 and *Cornelii Nepotis Vitae cum fragmentis*, ed. by Peter K. Marshall (Leipzig, 1977); trans. of and commentary on frags 2–9 in Horsfall 1989: 31–32, 117–18
- Descriptio consulum*: Burgess 1993: 215–45 and Mommsen 1892: 199–247
- Diodorus Siculus, *Bibliotheca*: Diodorus Siculus, *Library of History*, ed. and trans. by C. H. Oldfather and others, 12 vols, LCL, 279, 303, 340, 375, 384, 399, 389, 422, 377, 390, 409, 423 (Cambridge, MA, 1946–67)
- Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Antiquitates Romanae*: Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Roman Antiquities*, ed. and trans. by Ernest Cary, 7 vols, LCL, 319, 347, 357, 364, 372, 378, 388 (Cambridge, MA, 1937–50)
- Eusebius, *Chronici canones*: (1) Armenian translation: Latin translation by H. Petermann in Schoene 1866: 20–186; and German translation by Josef Karst in *Eusebius Werke*, v: *Die Chronik aus dem Armenischen Übersetzt mit textkritischem Commentar*, GCS, 20 (Leipzig, 1911), pp. 156–227; (2) Latin translation: see Jerome below
- , *Chronographia*: unless otherwise noted, always quoted from the German translation of the Armenian translation by Josef Karst in *Eusebius Werke*, v: *Die Chronik aus dem Armenischen Übersetzt mit textkritischem Commentar*, GCS, 20 (Leipzig, 1911), pp. 1–143. Other editions: (1) Greek fragments: *Anecdota Graeca e codd. manuscriptis bibliothecae regiae Parisensis*, II, ed. by John Anthony Cramer (Oxford, 1839; repr. Hildesheim, 1967), pp. 118–63, and (2) Armenian translation: Latin translation by H. Petermann in Schoene 1875: 1–295
- , *Historia ecclesiastica*: *Eusebius Werke*, II: *Die Kirchengeschichte*, ed. by Eduard Schwartz and Theodor Mommsen, GCS, 9, 1–2 (Leipzig, 1903–08); trans.: Eusebius, *The Ecclesiastical History*, trans. by Kirsopp Lake and J. E. L. Oulton, 2 vols, LCL, 153, 265 (Cambridge, MA, 1926–32)

- Eutropius, *Breviarium: Eutropii Breviarium ab urbe condita*, ed. by Carolus Santini (1979; repr. Stuttgart, 1992); trans.: *The Breviarium ab urbe condita of Eutropius*, trans. by H. W. Bird, TTH, 14 (Liverpool, 1993)
- Excerpta Sangallensia*: Mommsen 1892: 298–336 and Frick 1892: 421–23
- Fasti Ostiensis: Vidman 1982
- Florus, *Epitome*: Florus, *Epitome of Roman History*, ed. and trans. by E. S. Forster, LCL, 231 (Cambridge, MA, 1929)
- Fredegar, *Chronicae: Chronicarum quae dicuntur Fredegarii Scholastici Libri IV cum continuationibus*, in *Fredegarii et aliorum Chronica. Vitae sanctorum*, ed. by Bruno Krusch, MGH SRM, 2 (Hannover, 1888), pp. 18–193; book 4 with English trans. in J. M. Wallace-Hadrill 1960
- Gallic Chronicle of 452*: Burgess 2001a and Mommsen 1892: 617–25, 631, 646–62; trans.: A. Murray 2000: 76–85
- Gallic Chronicle of 511*: Burgess 2001b and Mommsen 1892: 626–28, 632–66; trans.: A. Murray 2000: 98–100
- Gellius, Aulus, *Noctes Atticae: A. Gellii Noctes Atticae*, ed. by P. K. Marshall, OCT (Oxford, 1968); *The Attic Nights of Aulus Gellius*, ed. and trans. by John C. Rolfe, 3 vols, LCL, 195, 200, 212 (Cambridge, MA, 1927)
- Gennadius, *De uiris illustribus: Hieronymus: Liber de uiris illustribus; Gennadius: Liber de uiris illustribus*, ed. by Ernest Cushing Richardson, TU, 14. 1a (Leipzig, 1896)
- George the Monk, *Chronicon: Georgii Monachi Chronicon*, ed. by Carl de Boor and Peter Wirth, BT (1904; repr. Stuttgart, 1978)
- Gervase of Canterbury, *Chronica: The Historical Works of Gervase of Canterbury*, vol. 1: *The Chronicle of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry III, and Richard I by Gervase, the Monk of Canterbury*, ed. by William Stubbs, Rolls Series, 73 (London, 1879)
- Glycas, *Annales: Michaelis Glycae Annales*, ed. by Im. Bekker, CSHB (Bonn, 1836)
- Gregory of Tours, *Historiae: Gregorii episcopi Turonensis Libri historiarum X*, ed. by Bruno Krusch and Wilhelm Levison, MGH SRM, 1. 1 (Hannover, 1951); trans.: Lewis Thorpe, *The History of the Franks* (Harmondsworth, 1974)
- Hydatius, chronicle: Burgess 1993 and Mommsen 1894: 3–36
- Isidore, *Chronica*: Martín 2003 and Mommsen 1894: 393–481
- , *Etymologiae: Isidori Hispalensis episcopi Etymologiarum sive Originum libri XX*, ed. by W. M. Lindsay, OCT (Oxford, 1966); trans.: Stephen A. Barney and others, *The Etymologies of Isidore of Seville* (Cambridge, 2006)
- , *Historia Gothorum Wandalorum Sueuorum*: Rodríguez Alonso 1975 and Mommsen 1894: 241–303; trans.: Wolf 1999
- Jerome, *Chronici canones: Eusebius Werke*, VII: *Die Chronik des Hieronymus; Hieronymi Chronicon*, ed. by Rudolf Helm, 3rd edn, GCS (Berlin, 1984), and *Eusebii Pamphili Chronici Canones, Latine uertit, adauxit, ad sua tempora produxit S. Eusebius Hieronymus*, ed. by John Knight Fotheringham (London, 1923)
- , *Commentarii in Daniele: Commentariorum in Daniele libri III <IV>*, ed. by Francisci Glorie, S. Hieronymi presbyteri opera, 1: opera exegetica 5, CCSL, 75A (Turnhout, 1964)
- , *Contra Rufinum: Contra Rufinum*, ed. by P. Lardet, S. Hieronymi presbyteri opera, 3: opera polemica 1, CCSL, 79 (Turnhout, 1982)

- , *De uiris illustribus*: Hieronymus: *Liber de uiris illustribus*; Gennadius: *Liber de uiris illustribus*, ed. by Ernest Cushing Richardson, TU, 14, 1a (Leipzig, 1896); Greek trans.: *Hieronymus de uiris illustribus in griechischer Übersetzung (Der sogenannte Sophronius)*, ed. by Oscar von Gebhardt, TU, 14, 1b (Leipzig, 1896)
- , *Onomasticon*: *Eusebius Werke*, III. 1: *Das Onomasticon*, ed. by Erich Klostermann, GCS, 11 (Leipzig, 1904)
- John of Antioch, Ἰστορία χρονική: *Ioannis Antiocheni Fragmenta quae supersunt omnia*, ed. by Sergei Mariev, CFHB, 47 (Berlin, 2008) (Greek text with English translation) and *Ioannis Antiocheni Fragmenta ex Historia chronica*, ed. by Umberto Roberto, TU, 154 (Berlin, 2005) (Greek text with Italian translation)
- John of Biclar, chronicle: Cardelle de Hartmann 2001: 59–83 and Mommsen 1894: 165–83 and 211–20
- Julius Africanus, *Chronographiae*: Wallraff 2007, Greek, Latin, and English
- Liber generationis*: Mommsen 1892: 78–138; Frick 1892: v–lxvii, 2–129; Bauer 1905; Bauer and Helm 1955 (= Latin translation of Συναγωγή χρόνων (see below))
- Livy, *Periochae*: Livy, *History of Rome*, XIV, ed. and trans. by Alfred C. Schlesinger, LCL, 404 (Cambridge, MA, 1959)
- Ps-Lucian, *Macrobii*: *Lucian*, I, ed. and trans. by A. M. Harmon (Cambridge, MA, 1913; repr. 1961), pp. 222–44
- Malalas, *Breviarium*: Thurn 2000; trans.: Jeffreys and others 1986
- Marcellinus comes, chronicle: Mommsen 1894: 39–108; text (Mommsen's) and trans.: Croke 1995
- Marius of Avenches, chronicle: Mommsen 1894: 227–39; French trans.: Favrod 1993; English trans.: A. Murray 2000: 101–08
- Nicephorus, Χρονογραφικὸν σύντομον: *Nicephori archiepiscopi Constantinopolitani Opuscula Historica*, ed. by Carl de Boor (Leipzig, 1880; repr. New York, 1975), pp. 81–135
- , Ἱστορία σύντομος: Mango 1990
- Notitia dignitatum*: *Notitia dignitatum*, ed. by Otto Seeck (Berlin, 1876)
- Paschale Campanum*: Mommsen 1892: 744–50
- Παραστάσεις σύντομοι χρονικά: *Scriptores originum Constantinopolitanarum*, I, ed. by T. Preger (Leipzig, 1901; repr. 1975), pp. 19–73
- Philoponus, John, *De opificio mundi*: Clemens Scholten, *Johannes Philoponos, De opificio mundi; Über die Erschaffung der Welt*, I, Fontes Christiani, 23, 1 (Freiburg, 1997)
- Photius, *Bibliotheca*: Photius, *Bibliothèque*, ed. and trans. by René Henry, Budé (Paris, 1959)
- Polemios Silvius, *Laterculus*: Mommsen 1892: 513–51 (non-calendar text) and Degraffi 1963: 264–75 (calendar)
- Pomponius Atticus, T., *Liber annalis*: HRR, II, 6–8; trans. of and commentary on frags 3–8 in Horsfall 1989: 39–40, 124
- Prosper, chronicle: Mommsen 1892: 343–485; trans.: Liam de Paor, *Saint Patrick's World: The Christian Culture of Ireland's Apostolic Age* (Blackrock, 1993), pp. 72–87 and A. Murray 2000: 62–76
- Quintillian, *Institutio oratoria*: Quintilian, *The Orator's Education*, ed. and trans. by Donald A. Russell, 5 vols, LCL, 124, 125, 126, 127, 494 (Cambridge, MA, 2002)
- Rufinus, *Apologia contra Hieronymum*: *Apologia contra Hieronymum*, ed. by Manlius Simonetti, Tyrannii Rufini opera, CCSL, 20 (Turnhout, 1961), pp. 37–123



- , *Historia ecclesiastica: Eusebius Werke*, II: *Die Kirchengeschichte*, ed. by Eduard Schwartz and Theodor Mommsen, GCS, 9. 2 (Leipzig, 1908); trans. (English): Philip R. Amidon, *The Church History of Rufinus of Aquileia* (Oxford, 1997)
- Scriptores originum Constantinopolitanarum: Scriptores originum Constantinopolitanarum*, ed. by Theodor Preger, BT (Leipzig, 1901–07)
- Sigebert of Gembloux, *Chronica: Sigeberti Gemblacensis Chronographia*: ed. by L. C. Bethmann, MGH SS, 6: 300–74
- Suda: Suidae Lexicon*, ed. by Ada Adler, Lexicographi Graeci, I (Leipzig, 1928–35; repr. 1967–71)
- Sulpicius Severus, *Chronica: Sulpicii Severi libri qui supersunt*, ed. by Carolus Halm, CSEL, 1 (Vienna, 1866); edn and French trans.: Ghislaine de Senneville-Grave, *Sulpice Sévère: Chroniques*, SC, 441 (Paris, 1999)
- Συναγωγή χρόνων: Bauer 1905, Bauer and Helm 1955 (see *Liber generationis*)
- Symeon the Logothete, Χρονικόν: Wahlgren 2006
- Syncellus, Georgius, Ἐκλογὴ χρονογραφίας (*Ecloga chronographica*): Mosshammer 1984; English trans.: Adler and Tuffin 2002
- Theodorus Scutariotes, Σύνοψις χρονική: *Bibliotheca graeca medii aevii*, VII, ed. by C. Sathas (Paris, 1894), pp. 1–556
- Theophanes, *Chronographia: Theophanis Chronographia*, I, ed. by Carl de Boor (Leipzig, 1883; repr. Hildesheim, 1963); trans.: Mango and Scott 1997
- Victor of Tunnuna, chronicle: Cardelle de Hartmann 2001: 3–55 and Mommsen 1894: 165–83 and 184–206
- Victorius of Aquitaine, *Cursus paschalis*: Mommsen 1892: 677–735
- Zonaras, Iohannes, *Annales: Ioannis Zonarae annales*, II, ed. by Maurice Pinder, and III, ed. by Theodor Büttner-Wobst, CSHB (Bonn, 1844–97)



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### *Abbreviations*

- AE* *L'Année épigraphique* (Paris, 1888–)
- BA* *Barrington Atlas of the Greek and Roman World*, ed. by Richard J. A. Talbert (Princeton, 2000)
- BNJ* *Brill's New Jacoby*, ed. by Ian Worthington (Leiden, 2010–), only available online at <<http://referenceworks.brillonline.com/browse/brill-s-new-jacoby>> and <<http://www.pauilyonline.brill.nl/browse/brill-s-new-jacoby>>
- BT* Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana
- Budé* Collection des universités de France publiée sous le patronage de l'Association Guillaume Budé
- CAH* *The Cambridge Ancient History*, x: *The Augustan Empire, 43 B.C.–A.D. 69*, ed. by Alan K. Bowman, Edward Champlin, and Andrew Lintott, 2nd edn (Cambridge, 1996)
- CCCM* Corpus Christianorum, Continuatio Mediaevalis
- CCSL* Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina
- CFHB* Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae
- CIL* *Corpus inscriptionum latinarum*, 15, plus *Supplementa* and *Auctuarium* (Berlin, 1863–)
- CLRE* Roger S. Bagnall and others, *Consuls of the Later Roman Empire* (Atlanta, 1987)
- CP* *Classical Philology*
- CSCO SS* Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium, Scriptores Syri
- CSEL* Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum
- CSHB* Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae
- DNP* *Der neue Pauly: Enzyklopädie der Antike*, ed. by Hubert Cancik and Helmuth Schneider (Stuttgart, 1996–2003); also available online at <<http://referenceworks.brillonline.com/browse/der-neue-pauly>> and <<http://www.pauilyonline.brill.nl/browse/der-neue-pauly>>; also available in an English translation: *Brill's New Pauly: Encyclopaedia of the Ancient World*, ed. by Hubert Cancik and others (Leiden,

- 2002–10), which is available online at <<http://referenceworks.brillonline.com/browse/brill-s-new-pauly>> and <<http://www.paulyonline.brill.nl/browse/brill-s-new-pauly>>
- FgrHist* *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*, ed. by Felix Jacoby, 3 parts in 15 vols (Berlin, 1923–59)
- FgrHistK* *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*, ed. by Felix Jacoby, associated commentary volumes (Berlin, 1923–59)
- GCS Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte
- HE *Historia ecclesiastica*
- HLL *Handbuch der lateinischen Literatur der Antike*, ed. by Reinhart Herzog and Peter Lebrecht Schmidt, IV: *Die Literatur des Umbruchs: Von der römischen zur christlichen Literatur, 117 bis 284 n. Chr.*, ed. by Klaus Sallmann, *Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft*, 8. 4 (Munich, 1997), and V: *Restauration und Erneuerung: Die lateinische Literatur von 284 bis 374 n. Chr.*, ed. by Reinhart Herzog, *Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft*, 8. 5 (Munich, 1989)
- HRR Herman Peter, *Historicorum Romanorum reliquiae*, 2 vols (Leipzig, 1914–16; repr. Stuttgart, 1967 and 1993)
- IG *Inscriptiones Graecae*, 14 vols (Berlin, 1873–)
- LCL Loeb Classical Library
- LMA *Lexikon des Mittelalters*, 10 vols (Munich, 1977–99)
- MGH Monumenta Germaniae Historica
- AA Auctores antiquissimi
- SRG in usum schol. Scriptores rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum separatim editi
- SRLang. Scriptores rerum Langobardicarum et Italicarum saec. VI–IX
- SRM Scriptores rerum Merovingicarum
- SS Scriptores
- OCD *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, ed. by Simon Hornblower and Antony Spawforth, 3rd edn (Oxford, 1996)
- OCT Oxford Classical Texts = Scriptorum classicorum bibliotheca Oxoniensis
- ODB *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, ed. by Alexander P. Kazhdan (Oxford, 1991)
- PCPS *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society*
- PG *Patrologiae cursus completus, Series graeca*, ed. by Jacques-Paul Migne, 161 vols (Paris, 1857–66)
- PL *Patrologiae cursus completus, Series latina*, ed. by Jacques-Paul Migne, 217 vols (Paris, 1844–65)
- PLRE *The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire*, I, ed. by A. H. M. Jones, J. R. Martindale, and J. Morris (Cambridge, 1971)
- POxy *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* (London, 1898–)
- RE *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, ed. by Georg Wissowa and others, 82 vols (Stuttgart, 1894–1980)
- RE Suppl. Supplemental volumes of RE

Rolls Series	Rerum Britannicarum Medii Aevi Scriptores or Chronicles and Memorials of Great Britain and Ireland during the Middle Ages, 99 vols (London, 1858–96)
SC	Sources chrétiennes
TTH	Translated Texts for Historians
TU	Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der althristlichen Literatur
ZPE	<i>Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik</i>

## Bibliography

- Abbeloos, J.-B., and T. J. Lamy (eds). 1872–77. *Gregorii Barhebraei Chronicon Ecclesiasticum*, 2 vols (Leuven)
- Adler, William. 1989. *Time Immemorial: Archaic History and its Sources in Christian Chronography from Julius Africanus to George Syncellus* (Washington, DC)
- . 1992. 'Eusebius' *Chronicle* and its Legacy', in *Eusebius, Christianity, and Judaism*, ed. by Harold W. Attridge and Gohei Hata, *Studia Post-Biblica*, 42 (Leiden), pp. 467–91
- Adler, William, and Paul Tuffin. 2002. *The Chronography of George Synkellos: A Byzantine Chronicle of Universal History from the Creation* (Oxford)
- Ainsworth, Peter F. 1990. *Jean Froissart and the Fabric of History: Truth, Myth, and Fiction in the 'Chroniques'* (Oxford)
- Albanès, J. H. 1886. 'La Chronique de St.-Victor de Marseille', *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire*, 6: 64–90, 287–326, 454–65
- Aldiss, Brian. 1986. *Trillion Year Spree: The History of Science Fiction* (New York)
- Alexander, P. J. 1958. *The Patriarch Nicephorus of Constantinople* (Oxford)
- Alföldy, Géza. 1975. *Die Römischen Inschriften von Tarraco*, *Madrid Forschungen*, 10 (Berlin)
- Allen, Michael I. 2002. *Frechulfi Lexoviensis episcopi opera omnia*, CCCM, 169–169A (Turnhout)
- Andrei, Osvalda. 2005. 'L'Emergere di una cronografia cristiana come fattore di costruzione identitaria', *Annali di storia dell'esegesi*, 22: 57–97
- . 2006. 'Dalle *Chronographiai* di Giulio Africano alla *Synagoge* di "Ippolito": Un dibattito sulla scrittura cristiana del tempo', in Wallraff 2006a: 113–45
- . 2007. 'Spazio geografico, etnografia ed evangelizzazione nella *Synagoge* di Ippolito', *Zeitschrift für antikes Christentum*, 11: 221–78
- . 2008. 'Per un commento alla *Historia Ecclesiastica* di Eusebio di Cesarea: I *Chronici Canones* quale *philosophia ex oraculis* antiporfiriana', *Adamantius*, 14: 151–90
- Arbesmann, Rudolph, Emily Joseph Daly, and Edwin A. Quain. 1950. *Tertullian: Apologetical Works; and Minucius Felix Octavius*, *Fathers of the Church: A New Translation*, 10 (Washington, DC)
- Aro, Sanna, and R. M. Whiting (eds). 2000. *The Heirs of Assyria: Proceedings of the Opening Symposium of the Assyrian and Babylonian Intellectual Heritage Project, held in Tvärminne, Finland, October 8–11, 1998*, *Melammu Symposia*, 1 (Helsinki)
- Attridge, Harold W., and Robert A. Oden, Jr. 1981. *Philo of Byblos: The Phoenician History*, *Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series*, 9 (Washington, DC)
- Bagnall, Roger S., and Klaas A. Worp. 2004. *Chronological Systems of Byzantine Egypt*, 2nd edn (Leiden)

- Banks, S. E., and J. W. Binns (eds). 2002. *Gervase of Tilbury, 'Otia Imperialia': Recreation for an Emperor*, Oxford Medieval Texts (Oxford)
- Bannerman, John. 1968. 'Notes on the Scottish Entries in the Early Irish Annals', *Scottish Gaelic Studies*, 11: 149–70
- Barchiesi, Alessandro, Jörg Rüpke, and Susan Stephens (eds). 2004. *Rituals in Ink: A Conference on Religion and Literary Production in Ancient Rome held at Stanford University in February 2002*, Potsdamer altertumswissenschaftliche Beiträge, 10 (Stuttgart)
- Bargagli, Barbara, and Cristiana Grosso. 1997. *I Fasti Ostienses: Documento della storia di Ostia*, Itinerari Ostiensi, 8 (Rome)
- Barnes, Timothy D. 1971. *Tertullian: A Historical and Literary Study* (Oxford; repr. with addenda 1985)
- . 1978. *The Sources of the 'Historia Augusta'* (Brussels)
- . 1981. *Constantine and Eusebius* (Cambridge, MA)
- . 1998. *Ammianus Marcellinus and the Representation of Historical Reality* (Ithaca)
- . 2004. 'The *Historia Augusta*, Nicomachus Flavianus, and Peter the Patrician', *Classical Review*, 54: 120–24
- Barrau Dihigo, L., and J. Massó i Torrents. 1925. *Gesta comitum Barcinonesium: Textos llats i català*, Cròniques catalanes, 2 (Barcelona)
- Barthes, Roland. 1977. *Image Music Text*, trans. by S. Heath (New York)
- Bauer, Adolf. 1905. *Die Chronik des Hippolytos im Matritensis graecus 121*, TU, n.s., 14. 1 (Leipzig)
- Bauer, Adolf, and Rudolf Helm. 1955. *Hippolytus Werke*, IV: *Die Chronik*, GCS, 46 (Berlin)
- Bauer, Adolf, and Josef Strzygowski. 1905. *Eine alexandrinische Weltchronik*, Denkschriften der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften, phil.-hist. Klasse, 51 (Vienna)
- Baumgarten, Albert I. 1981. *The Phoenician History of Philo of Byblos: A Commentary*, Études préliminaires aux religions orientales dans l'empire romain, 89 (Leiden)
- Bautier, Robert-Henri. 1970. 'L'Historiographie en France aux X<sup>e</sup> et XI<sup>e</sup> siècles France du Nord et de l'Est', in *Settimane di Studio XVII* 1970: 793–850
- Bayet, Jean. 1947. *Tite-Live. Histoire Romaine. Tome I, livre I*, Budé (Paris)
- Beard, Mary. 1987. 'A Complex of Times: No More Sheep on Romulus' Birthday', *PCPS*, n.s., 33: 1–15
- . 2004. 'Writing Ritual: The Triumph of Ovid', in Barchiesi, Rüpke, and Stephens 2004: 115–26
- Beck, Hans-Georg. 1971. *Geschichte der byzantinischen Volksliteratur*, Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft, 12. 2. 3 (Munich)
- di Berardino, Angelo (ed.). 1992. *Encyclopedia of the Early Church*, 2 vols (New York)
- Berenbaum, Michael, and Fred Skolnik (eds). 2007. *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, 2nd edn (Detroit)
- Berger, E. 1879. 'Annales de St-Denis généralement connues sous le titre de Chronicon Sancti Dionisii ad cyclos paschales', *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes*, 40: 261–95
- Bertelli, Lucio. 2001. 'Hecataeus: From Genealogy to Historiography', in Luraghi 2001a: 67–94
- Bickerman, Elias. 1980a. 'The Jewish Historian Demetrios', in *Studies in Jewish and Christian History*, II, Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums, 9 (Leiden), pp. 347–58 (originally printed in *Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults: Studies for Morton Smith at Sixty*, III: *Judaism before 70*, ed. by J. Neisner (Leiden, 1975), pp. 72–84)
- . 1980b. *Chronology of the Ancient World*, 2nd edn (London)
- Bienkowski, Piotr, and Alan Millard (eds). 2000. *Dictionary of the Ancient Near East* (Philadelphia)

- Birley, A. R. 1991. 'Mapping a Minefield', *Classical Review*, 41: 410–11
- . 1998. 'Decius Reconsidered', in *Les Empereurs illyriens: Actes du colloque de Strasbourg (11–13 octobre 1990) organisé par le Centre de recherche sur l'Europe centrale et sud-orientale. Université des Sciences humaines de Strasbourg. Contributions et travaux de l'Institut d'Histoire romaine* 8, ed. by Edmond Frézouls and Hélène Jouffroy (Strasbourg), pp. 57–80
- Bischoff, Bernhard. 1974. *Lorsch im Spiegel seiner Handschriften* (Munich)
- Bischoff, Bernhard, and Wilhelm Koehler. 1939. 'Eine illustrierte Ausgabe der spätantiken raven-nater Annalen', in *Medieval Studies in Memory of A. Kingsley Porter*, I, ed. by Wilhelm R. W. Koehler (Cambridge, MA), pp. 125–38
- Bloch, H. (ed.). 1907. *Annales Marbacenses qui dicuntur*, MGH SRG in usum schol., 9 (Hannover)
- Blockley, R. C. 1983. *The Fragmentary Classicising Historians of the Later Roman Empire: Euna-pius, Olympiodorus, Priscus and Malchus*, II: *Text, Translation and Historiographical Notes*, ARCA, 10 (Liverpool)
- Bonnassie, Pierre. 1975–76. *La Catalogne du milieu du X<sup>e</sup> à la fin du XI<sup>e</sup> siècle: croissance et mutation d'une société*, 2 vols (Toulouse)
- Bonnaz, Yves. 1987. *Chroniques asturiennes (fin IX<sup>e</sup> siècle)* (Paris)
- de Boor, Carl (ed.). 1880. *Nicephori archiepiscopi Constantinopolitani, Opuscula historica* (Leipzig; repr. New York, 1975), pp. 81–135
- Breasted, James Henry. 1906. *Ancient Records of Egypt: Historical Documents*, I and II (Chicago; repr. New York, 1962)
- Brent, Allen. 1995. *Hippolytus and the Roman Church in the Third Century: Communities in Ten-sion before the Emergence of a Monarch-Bishop*, *Vigiliae Christianae Supplement*, 31 (Leiden)
- von den Brincken, A.-D. 1957. *Studien zur lateinischen Weltchronistik bis in das Zeitalter Ottos von Freising* (Düsseldorf)
- Brind'Amour, Pierre. 1983. *Le Calendrier romain: recherches chronologiques* (Ottawa)
- Briscoe, John. 2008. *A Commentary on Livy, Books 38–40* (Oxford)
- Brooke, C. N. L. 1970. 'Historical Writing in England between 850 and 1150', in *Settimane di Studio XVII* 1970: 223–47
- Brunhölzl, F. 1975. *Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters*, I: *Von Cassiodor bis zum Ausklang der karolingischen Erneuerung* (Munich)
- Bryce, Trevor. 2005. *The Kingdom of the Hittites* (Oxford)
- Buchner, Rudolf. 1960. 'Geschichtsbild und Reichsbegriff Hermanns von Reichenau', *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte*, 42: 37–60
- . 1970. 'Die frühaltische Geschichtsschreibung in Deutschland', in *Settimane di Studio XVII* 1970: 895–944
- Buck, D. F. 1984. 'A Reconsideration of Dexippus' *Chronica*', *Latomus*, 43: 596–97
- Budge, E. A. W. 1932. *The Chronography of Gregory Abū'l-Faraj, the Son of Aaron, the Hebrew Physician Commonly Known as Bar Hebraeus, being the First Part of his Political History of the World Translated from the Syriac*, 2 vols (London)
- Burgess, R. W. 1988. 'Hydatius: A Late Roman Chronicler in Post-Roman Spain' (unpublished D.Phil. thesis, University of Oxford)
- . 1993. *The 'Chronicle' of Hydatius and the 'Consularia Constantinopolitana': Two Con-temporary Accounts of the Final Years of the Roman Empire* (Oxford)
- . 1996. 'Hydatius and the Final Frontier: The Fall of the Roman Empire and the End of the World', in *Shifting Frontiers in Late Antiquity*, ed. by Ralph W. Mathisen and Hagith S. Sivan (Aldershot), pp. 321–32

- . 1997. 'The Dates and Editions of Eusebius' *Chronici canones* and *Historia ecclesiastica*', *Journal of Theological Studies*, n.s., 48: 471–504 = Burgess 2011, Paper I
- . 1999. *Studies in Eusebian and Post-Eusebian Chronography*, Historia Einzelschrift, 135 (Stuttgart)
- . 2000. "Non duo Antonini sed duo Augusti": The Consuls of 161 and the Origins and Traditions of the Latin Consular *Fasti* of the Roman Empire', *ZPE*, 132: 259–90 = Burgess 2011, Paper XV
- . 2001a. 'The Gallic Chronicle of 452: A New Critical Edition with a Brief Introduction', in Mathisen and Shanzer 2001: 52–84
- . 2001b. 'The Gallic Chronicle of 511: A New Critical Edition with a Brief Introduction', in Mathisen and Shanzer 2001: 85–100
- . 2002. 'Jerome Explained: An Introduction to his *Chronicle* and a Guide to its Use', *Ancient History Bulletin*, 16: 1–32 = Burgess 2011, Paper III
- . 2003. 'The *Passio S. Artemii*, Philostorgius, and the Dates of the Invention and Translations of the Relics of Sts Andrew and Luke', *Analecta Bollandiana*, 121: 5–36 = Burgess 2011, Paper XI
- . 2006a. 'Apologetic and Chronography: The Antecedents of Julius Africanus', in Wallraff 2006a: 17–42
- . 2006b. 'A Chronological Prolegomenon to Reconstructing Eusebius' *Chronici canones*: The Evidence of Ps-Dionysius (the *Zuqnin Chronicle*)', *Journal of the Canadian Society for Syriac Studies*, 6: 29–38 = Burgess 2011, Paper II
- . 2011. *Chronicles, Consuls, and Coins: Historiography and History in the Later Roman Empire*, Variorum, CS 984 (Farnham)
- . 2012. 'The Chronograph of 354: Its Manuscripts, its Contents, and its History', *Journal of Late Antiquity*, 5 (in press)
- . Forthcoming. 'The Date, Purpose, and Historical Context of the Original Greek and the Latin Translation of the So-called Excerpta Latina Barbari'
- Burgess, R. W., and Jitse H. F. Dijkstra. 2012. 'The Berlin "Chronicle" (*P. Berol. inv. 13296*): A New Edition of the Earliest Extant Late Antique *Consularia*', *Archiv für Papyrusforschung*, 58 (in press)
- . Forthcoming. 'The "Alexandrian World Chronicle", its *Consularia* and the Date of the Destruction of the Serapeum (with an Appendix on the List of *Praefecti Augustales*)', *Millennium*, 10
- Burkert, Walter. 1992. *The Orientalizing Revolution: Near Eastern Influence on Greek Culture in the Early Archaic Age* (Cambridge, MA)
- . 1995. 'Lydia between East and West or How to Date the Trojan War: A Study in Herodotus', in *The Ages of Homer: A Tribute to Emily Townsend Vermeule*, ed. by Jane B. Carter and Sarah P. Morris (Austin), pp. 139–48
- . 2004. *Babylon, Memphis, Persepolis: Eastern Contexts of Greek Culture* (Cambridge, MA)
- Burrow, John. 2009. *A History of Histories* (London; orig. publ. 2007)
- Burstein, Stanley Mayer. 1978. *The 'Babyloniaca' of Berossus*, Sources and Monographs on the Ancient Near East, 5. 1 (Malibu)
- . 1985. *The Hellenistic Age from the Battle of Ipsos to the Death of Kleopatra VII*, Translated Documents of Greece and Rome, 3 (Cambridge)
- Byrne, Francis John. 1967. 'Seventh-Century Documents', *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, 108: 164–82



- Cameron, Alan. 1976. *Circus Factions: Blues and Greens at Rome and Byzantium* (Oxford)
- . 2010. *The Last Pagans of Rome* (Oxford)
- Cameron, Averil. 1992. 'New Themes and Styles in Greek Literature: Seventh-Eighth Centuries', in Cameron and Conrad 1992: 81–105
- Cameron, Averil, and Lawrence I. Conrad (eds). 1992. *The Byzantine and Early Islamic Near East, I: Problems in the Literary Source Material* (Princeton)
- Cardelle de Hartmann, Carmen. 2000. 'Historie und Chronographie: Entstehung und Frühzeit lateinischer Chronistik (von Hieronymus bis Beda)', *Minerva* (Valladolid), 14: 107–27
- . 2001. *Victoris Tunnunensis Chronicon cum reliquiis ex Consularibus Caesaraugustanis et Iohannis Biclarenensis Chronicon*, CCSL, 173A (Turnhout)
- Casamassa, Antonio. 1944. *Gli apologisti greci* (Rome)
- Cerrato, J. A. 2002. *Hippolytus between East and West: The Commentaries and the Provenance of the Corpus* (Oxford)
- Cerro Calderón, Gónzalo del, and José Palacios Royán. 2002. *Obras de Elipando de Toledo* (Toledo)
- Cessi, Roberto. 1916. 'Studi sulle fonti dell'età Gotica e Longobarda I. "Fasti Vindobonenses"', *Archivio Muratoriano*, 17–18: 293–405
- . 1922. 'Studi sulle fonti dell'età Gotica e Longobarda II. "Prosperi Continuatio Hauniensis"', *Archivio Muratoriano*, 22: 586–641
- Chabot, J.-B. 1899–1924. *Chronique de Michel le Syrien patriarche jacobite d'Antioche (1166–1199)*, 4 vols (Paris)
- . 1900. 'Notes d'épigraphie et d'archéologie orientale', *Journal asiatique*, 9th ser., 16: 249–88
- . 1921. 'La Littérature historique des Syriens', *Revue historique*, 137: 74–80
- Chaniotis, Angelos. 1988. *Historie und Historiker in den griechischen Inschriften*, Heidelberger althistorische Beiträge und epigraphische Studien, 4 (Stuttgart)
- Charles-Edwards, T. M. 2006. *The Chronicle of Ireland*, TTH, 44 (Liverpool)
- Chassignet, Martine. 1999. *L'Annalistique romaine*, II: *L'Annalistique moyenne (fragments)*, Budé (Paris)
- . 2004. *L'Annalistique romaine*, III: *L'Annalistique récente. L'Autobiographie politique (fragments)*, Budé (Paris)
- Chavanon, Jules. 1897. *Adémar de Chabannes: Chronique* (Paris)
- Chazan, Mireille. 1999. *L'Empire et l'histoire universelle de Sigebert de Gembloux à Jean de Saint-Victor (XII<sup>e</sup>–XIV<sup>e</sup> siècle)* (Paris)
- Chesnut, Glenn F. 1986. *The First Christian Histories: Eusebius, Socrates, Sozomen, Theodoret, and Evagrius*, 2nd edn (Macon)
- Christesen, Paul. 2007. *Olympic Victor Lists and Ancient Greek History* (Cambridge)
- Christesen, Paul, and Zara Martirosova-Torlone. 2006. 'The Olympic Victor List of Eusebius: Background, Text, and Translation', *Traditio*, 61: 31–93
- Clarke, Katherine. 2008. *Making Time for the Past: Local History and the Polis* (Oxford)
- Coarelli, Filippo. 1996. 'Il monumento di Verrio Flacco nel foro di Preneste', in Filippo Coarelli, *Revixit ars: Arte e ideologia a Roma. Dai modelli ellenistici alla tradizione Repubblicana* (Rome), pp. 455–69
- . 1997. *Il Campo Marzio: Dalle origini alla fine della repubblica* (Rome)
- Codoñer Merino, Carmen. 1964. *El 'De viris illustribus' de Isidoro de Sevilla: estudio y edición crítica* (Salamanca)
- . 1972. *El 'De viris illustribus' de Ildefonso de Toledo: estudio y edición crítica* (Salamanca)

- Coleman, Edward. 2007. 'Lombard City Annals and the Social and Cultural History of Northern Italy', in *Chronicling History: Chroniclers and Historians in Medieval and Renaissance Italy*, ed. by Sharon Dale, Alison Williams Lewin, and Duane J. Osheim (University Park), pp. 1–27
- Colish, M. L. 1997. *Medieval Foundations of the Western Intellectual Tradition, 400–1400* (New Haven)
- Coll i Alentorn, Miquel. 1951–52. 'La historiografia de Catalunya en el període primitiu', *Estudis romànics*, 3: 139–96
- Collins, John J. 1998. *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature*, 2nd edn, Biblical Resource Series (Grand Rapids, MI)
- Collins, Roger. 1994. 'Isidore, Maximus and the *Historia Gothorum*', in *Historiographie im frühen Mittelalter*, ed. by A. Scharer and G. Scheibelreiter (Vienna), pp. 354–58
- . 1996. 'Fredegar', in *Authors of the Middle Ages, IV: Historical and Religious Writers of the Latin West, nos. 12–13, Gregory the Great and Fredegar*, ed. by P. Geary (Aldershot), pp. 73–138 [Note: this article is also individually paginated, with p. 1 corresponding to p. 81 of the volume]
- . 1998. *Charlemagne* (Toronto)
- . 2007. *Die Fredegar-Chroniken*, MGH Studien und Texte, 44 (Hannover)
- Colomo, Daniela, and others. 2010. 'Die älteste Weltchronik: Europa, die Sintflut und das Lamm', *Archiv für Papyrusforschung*, 56: 1–25
- Colson, F. H., and Ralph Marcus (eds and trans). 1929–53. *Philo*, LCL, 226, 261, 289, 320, 341, 363, 380 (Cambridge, MA)
- Corbier, Mireille. 2006. *Donner à voir, donner à lire: mémoire et communication dans la Rome ancienne* (Paris)
- Cornell, T. J. 1995. *The Beginnings of Rome: Italy and Rome from the Bronze Age to the Punic Wars (c. 1000–264 BC)* (London)
- . 2010. 'Universal History and the Early Roman Historians', in Liddel and Fear 2010: 102–15
- Croke, Brian. 1982. 'The Originality of Eusebius' Chronicle', *American Journal of Philology*, 103: 195–200
- . 1983a. 'The Origins of the Christian World Chronicle', in *History and Historians in Late Antiquity*, ed. by Brian Croke and Alanna M. Emmett (Sydney), pp. 116–31
- . 1983b. 'Porphyry's Anti-Christian Chronology', *Journal of Theological Studies*, n.s., 34: 168–85
- . 1990a. 'Byzantine Chronicle Writing 1: The Early Development of Byzantine Chronicles', in Jeffreys, Croke, and Scott 1990: 27–38
- . 1990b. 'City Chronicles of Late Antiquity', in *Reading the Past in Late Antiquity*, ed. by Graeme Clarke and others (Sydney), pp. 165–203
- . 1990c. 'Malalas, the Man and his Work', in Jeffreys, Croke, and Scott 1990: 1–25
- . 1995. *The Chronicle of Marcellinus*, Byzantina Australiensia, 7 (Sydney)
- . 2001a. *Count Marcellinus and his Chronicle* (Oxford)
- . 2001b. 'Chronicles, Annals and "Consular Annals" in Late Antiquity', *Chiron*, 31: 291–331
- Cross, F. L., and E. A. Livingstone (eds). 2005. *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, 3rd rev. edn (Oxford)
- Dagron, Gilbert. 1984. *Constantinople imaginaire: études sur le recueil des 'Patria'* (Paris)

- Dain, A. 1954. 'La Transmission des textes littéraires classiques de Photius: Constantin Porphyrogénète', *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 8: 33–47
- Darlington, R. R., and P. McGurk. 1995–98. *The Chronicle of John of Worcester*, Oxford Medieval Texts, 2 vols (Oxford)
- Debié, Muriel. 2009. *L'Historiographie syriaque*, Études syriaques, 6 (Paris)
- Decreus, Freddy. 1984. 'Catulle, c. 1, Cornelius Nepos et les *Aitia* de Callimaque', *Latomus*, 43: 842–60
- Degrassi, Atilio. 1947. *Fasti et elogia*, I: *Fasti consulares et triumphales*, Inscriptiones Italiae, 13 (Rome)
- . 1963. *Fasti et elogia*, II: *Fasti anni Numani et Iuliani*, Inscriptiones Italiae, 13 (Rome)
- Deliyannis, Deborah Maukopf (ed.). 2003. *Historiography in the Middle Ages* (Leiden)
- (trans.). 2004. *The Book of Pontiffs of the Church of Ravenna* (Washington, DC)
- (ed.). 2006. *Agnelli Ravennatis Liber pontificalis ecclesiae Ravennatis*, CCCM, 199 (Turnhout)
- Dewald, Carolyn, and John Marincola (eds). 2006. *The Cambridge Companion to Herodotus* (Cambridge)
- Díaz y Díaz, Manuel C. 1963. 'La transmisión textual de Biclarense', *Analecta Sacra Tarraconensia*, 33: 57–76
- . 1970. 'La historiografía hispana desde la invasión árabe hasta el año 1000', in *Settimane di Studio XVII* 1970: 313–43
- Dickey, Eleanor. 2007. *Ancient Greek Scholarship: A Guide to Finding, Reading, and Understanding Scholia, Commentaries, Lexica, and Grammatical Treatises, from their Beginning to the Byzantine Period* (Oxford)
- Diller, George T. 1991. *Froissart Chroniques: Livre I. Le manuscrit d'Amiens*, Textes littéraires français, 407 (Geneva)
- Donalson, Malcolm Drew. 1996. *A Translation of Jerome's 'Chronicon' with Historical Commentary* (Lewiston)
- Dooley, Ann. 2006. 'The Plague and its Consequences in Ireland', in *Plague and the End of Antiquity: The Pandemic of 541–750*, ed. by Lester K. Little (Cambridge), pp. 215–30
- Döpp, Siegm, and Wilhelm Geerlings (eds). 2000. *Dictionary of Early Christian Literature* (New York)
- Doran, Robert. 1987. 'The Jewish Hellenistic Historians before Josephus', in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, II. 20. 1, ed. by Wolfgang Haase (Berlin), pp. 246–97
- Dorandi, T. 1982. *La Cronologia di Apollodoro nel PHerc. 1021* (Naples)
- Drews, Robert. 1975. 'The Babylonian Chronicles and Berossus', *Iraq*, 37: 39–55
- Droge, Arthur J. 1989. *Homer or Moses? Early Christian Interpretations of the History of Culture* (Tübingen)
- Drost-Abgarjan, Armenuhi. 2006. 'Ein neuer Fund zur armenischen Version der Eusebios-Chronik', in Wallraff 2006a: 255–62
- Dubler, C. 1946. 'Sobre la crónica arábigo-bizantina de 741 y la influencia bizantina en la Península Ibérica', *Al-Andalus*, 11: 283–349
- Duchesne, L. 1957. *Le Liber Pontificalis: texte, introduction et commentaire*, III (Paris; repr. with additional introductory material in 1981)
- Dumville, David. 1985. 'On Editing and Translating Medieval Irish Chronicles: The *Annals of Ulster*', *Cambridge Medieval Celtic Studies*, 10: 67–86

- . 2002. 'What Is a Chronicle?', in *The Medieval Chronicle*, II: *Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on the Medieval Chronicle, Driebergen/Utrecht 16–21 July 1999*, ed. by Erik Kooper, Costerus, n.s. 144 (Amsterdam), pp. 1–27
- Dunphy, R. Graeme. 2004. 'Historical Writing in and after the Old High German Period', in *German Literature of the Early Middle Ages*, ed. by Brian Murdoch (New York), pp. 201–25
- . 2010a. 'Chronicles (terminology)', in Dunphy and others 2010: 274–82
- . 2010b. 'Annals', in Dunphy and others 2010: 45–52
- Dunphy, Graeme, and others (eds). 2010. *The Encyclopedia of the Medieval Chronicle* (Leiden)
- Duplès-Agier, H. 1874. *Chroniques de Saint-Martial de Limoges publiées d'après les manuscrits originaux* (Paris)
- Dyck, Andrew R. 1993. 'Aelius Herodian: Recent Studies and Prospects for Future Research', in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, II. 34, ed. by Hildegard Temporini and Wolfgang Haase (Berlin), pp. 772–94
- Ebeling, Erich, and Bruno Meissner (eds). 1938. *Reallexikon der Assyriologie*, II (Berlin)
- Ebeling, Erich, and others (eds). 1980. *Reallexikon der Assyriologie*, VI (Berlin)
- Eck, Werner. 1991. 'Consules ordinarii und consules suffecti als eponyme Amtsträger', in *Epigraphia: Actes du Colloque international d'épigraphie latine en mémoire de Attilio Degrassi*, Collection de l'École Française de Rome, 143 (Rome), pp. 15–44
- Eder, W. 1990. 'Augustus and the Power of Tradition: The Augustan Principate as Binding Link between Republic and Empire', in Raaflaub and Toher 1990: 71–122
- Eder, Walter, and Johannes Renger (eds). 2007. *Chronologies of the Ancient World: Names, Dates and Dynasties*, DNP, Supplement 1 (Leiden)
- Edwards, M. J. 1990. 'Atticizing Moses? Numenius, the Fathers and the Jews', *Vigiliae Christianae*, 44: 64–75
- Edwards, Mark, Martin Goodman, and Simon Price (eds). 1999. *Apologetics in the Roman Empire: Pagans, Jews, and Christians* (Oxford)
- Edzard, D. O. 1980. 'Königslisten und Chroniken. A. Sumerisch', in Ebeling and others 1980: 77–86
- Eigler, Ulrich, and others (eds). 2003. *Formen römischer Geschichtsschreibung von den Anfängen bis Livius: Gattungen—Autoren—Kontexte* (Darmstadt)
- Elliott, Jackie. 2010. 'Ennius as Universal Historian: The Case of the *Annales*', in Liddel and Fear 2010: 148–61
- Elton, Geoffrey. 2002. *The Practice of History*, 2nd edn revised by Richard J. Evans (Oxford)
- Evans, Nicholas. 2010. *The Present and the Past in Medieval Irish Chronicles* (Woodbridge)
- Fabrizi, Virginia. 2008. 'Ennio e l'aedes Herculis Musarum', *Athenaeum*, 96: 193–219
- Favrod, Justin. 1993. *La Chronique de Marius d'Avenches (455–581)*, 2nd edn, Cahiers Lausannois d'histoire médiévale, 4 (Lausanne)
- Feeney, Denis. 1998. *Literature and Religion at Rome: Cultures, Contexts, and Beliefs* (Cambridge)
- . 2007. *Caesar's Calendar: Ancient Time and the Beginnings of History*, Sather Classical Lectures, 65 (Berkeley)
- Feldman, Louis H. 1990. 'Origen's *Contra Celsum* and Josephus' *Contra Apionem*: The Issue of Jewish Origins', *Vigiliae Christianae*, 44: 105–35
- Ferguson, John. 1991. *Clement of Alexandria. Stromateis. Books 1–3*, Fathers of the Church, 85 (Washington, DC)
- Ferreiro, Alberto. 1988. *The Visigoths in Gaul and Spain, A.D. 418–711: A Bibliography* (Leiden)

- . 2006. *The Visigoths in Gaul and Iberia: A Supplemental Bibliography, 1984–2003* (Leiden)
- . 2008. *The Visigoths in Gaul and Iberia Update: A Supplemental Bibliography, 2004–2006* (Leiden)
- Finegan, Jack. 1998. *Handbook of Biblical Chronology: Principles of Time Reckoning in the Ancient World and Problems of Chronology in the Bible*, 2nd edn (Peabody, MA)
- Finkel, I. L., and J. E. Reade. 1995. 'Lots of Eponyms', *Iraq*, 57: 167–72
- Finkel, I. L., and R. J. van der Spek. Forthcoming. *Babylonian Chronicles of the Hellenistic Period*; until publication, texts, translations, and commentaries can be consulted at <<http://www.livius.org/cg-cm/chronicles/chron00.html>>
- First, Mitchell. 1997. *Jewish History in Conflict: A Study of the Major Discrepancy between Rabbinic and Conventional Chronology* (Northvale, NJ)
- Fitzgerald, William, and Emily Gowers (eds). 2007. *Ennius Perennis: The 'Annals' and Beyond*, PCPS Supplementary Volume, 31 (Cambridge)
- Fontaine, Jacques. 1960. *Isidore de Séville: Traité de la nature* (Bordeaux)
- . 2000. *Isidore de Séville: genèse et originalité de la culture hispanique au temps des Wisigoths* (Turnhout)
- Fontaine, Jacques, and Christine Pellistrandi (eds). 1992. *L'Europe héritière de l'Espagne wisigothique* (Madrid)
- Fornara, Charles William. 1983. *The Nature of History in Ancient Greece and Rome*, Eidos: Studies in Classical Kinds (Berkeley)
- Forsythe, Gary. 2005. *A Critical History of Early Rome: From Prehistory to the First Punic War* (Berkeley)
- Fowler, Robert. 1996. 'Herodotos and his Contemporaries', *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 116: 62–87
- . 2001. 'Early *Historiae* and Literacy', in Luraghi 2001a: 95–115
- . 2006. 'Herodotus and his Prose Predecessors', in Dewald and Marincola 2006: 29–45
- Fox, Matthew. 2007. *Cicero's Philosophy of History* (Oxford)
- Fraser, P. M. 1970. 'Eratosthenes of Cyrene', *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 56: 175–207 = *Eratosthenes of Cyrene* (London, 1971)
- Freeman, A. Martin. 1924–25. 'The Annals in Cotton MS. Titus A. XXV', *Revue Celtique*, 41–42: 301–30
- Frend, W. H. C. 1982. 'Constantine and Eusebius', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 33: 590–95
- Freund, A. 1882. *Beiträge zur antiochenischen und zur konstantinopolitanischen Stadtchronik* (Jena)
- Frick, Karl. 1892. *Chronica minora*, I (Leipzig)
- Fried, Johannes. 2008. *Die Formierung Europas, 840–1046*, 3rd edn, Oldenbourg Grundriss der Geschichte, 6 (Munich)
- Frier, Bruce Woodward. 1979. *Libri annales pontificum maximorum: The Origins of the Annalistic Tradition*, Papers and Monographs of the American Academy in Rome, 27 (Rome)
- . 1999. *Libri annales pontificum maximorum: The Origins of the Annalistic Tradition*, Papers and Monographs of the American Academy in Rome, 27 (Ann Arbor): citations only to new preface; text remains as Frier 1979
- Gager, John G. 1972. *Moses in Greco-Roman Paganism*, Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series, 16 (Nashville)
- Galbraith, V. H. 1964. *Introduction to the Study of History* (London)
- Ganshof, F. L. 1970. 'L'Historiographie dans la monarchie franque sous les mérovingiens et les Carolingiens', in *Settimane di Studio XVII* 1970: 631–85

- Garbarino, Giovanna. 1973. *Roma e la filosofia greca dalle origini alla fine del II secolo a.C.*, 2 vols (Turin)
- Garmonsway, G. N. 1953. *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, Everyman's Library, 624 (London)
- Garstad, Benjamin. 2012. *Apocalypse. Pseudo-Methodius. An Alexandrian World Chronicle*, Dumbarton Oaks Medieval Library, 14 (Cambridge, MA)
- Geiger, Joseph. 2008. *The First Hall of Fame: A Study of the Statues in the 'Forum Augustum'*, Mnemosyne Supplement, 295 (Leiden)
- Geller, M. J. 2000. 'The Survival of Babylonian Wissenschaft in Later Tradition', in Aro and Whiting 2000: 1–6
- Gelzer, Heinrich. 1880. *Sextus Julius Africanus und die Byzantinische Chronographie*, I (Leipzig)
- . 1885. *Sextus Julius Africanus und die Byzantinische Chronographie*, II (Leipzig)
- Gerberding, Richard. 1987. *The Rise of the Carolingians and the 'Liber historiae Francorum'* (Oxford)
- Geus, Klaus. 2002. *Eratosthenes von Kyrene: Studien zur hellenistischen Kultur- und Wissenschaftsgeschichte*, Münchener Beiträge zur Papyrusforschung und antiken Rechtsgeschichte, 92 (Munich)
- Gil, Juan. 1973. *Corpus scriptorum Muzarabicorum*, 2 vols (Madrid)
- Gildenhard, Ingo. 2003. 'The "Annalist" before the Annalists: Ennius and his *Annales*', in Eigler and others 2003: 93–114
- . 2007. 'Virgil vs. Ennius, or: The Undoing of the Annalist', in Fitzgerald and Gowers 2007: 73–102
- Glassner, Jean-Jacques. 2004. *Mesopotamian Chronicles*, Society of Biblical Literature Writings from the Ancient World, 19 (Atlanta)
- Gleeson, Dermot, and Seán Mac Airt. 1958. 'The Annals of Roscrea', *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy*, 59 C: 145–71
- Goffart, Walter. 1963. 'The Fredegar Problem Reconsidered', *Speculum*, 38: 206–41 (repr. with addenda in Goffart 1989: 319–54)
- . 1989. *Rome's Fall and After* (London)
- . 2009. 'Roger Collins, *Die Fredegar-Chroniken*, MGH Studien und Texte 44 (Hannover, 2007)', *Medieval Review*, 09.02.08, <<https://scholarworks.iu.edu/dspace/bitstream/handle/2022/6500/09.02.08.html?sequence=1>>
- Gómez-Moreno, M. 1932. 'Las primeras crónicas de la reconquista: el ciclo de Alfonso III', *Boletín de la Academia de la Historia*, 100: 622–28
- González, Julian. 1990. *Bronces jurídicos de Andalucía* (Madrid)
- Goodenough, Edwin R. 1940. *An Introduction to Philo Judaeus* (Oxford)
- Goodman, Martin. 1999. 'Josephus' Treatise *Against Apion*', in Edwards, Goodman, and Price 1999: 45–58
- Gotter, Ulrich, and others. 2003. 'Einleitung', in Eigler and others 2003: 9–38
- Goulet, Richard. 1977. 'Porphyre et la datation de Moïse', *Revue de l'histoire des religions*, 192: 137–64
- Gozzoli, Sandra. 1970–71. 'Una teoria antica sull'origine della storiografia greca', *Studi classici e orientali*, 19–20: 158–211
- Grabbe, Lester L. 1979. 'Chronography in Hellenistic Jewish Historiography', in *Society of Biblical Literature, 1979 Seminar Papers*, II, ed. by Paul J. Achtemeier, Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers Series, 17 (Missoula, MT), pp. 43–68

- Grafton, Anthony. 1995. 'Tradition and Technique in Historical Chronology', in *Ancient History and the Antiquarian: Essays in Memory of Arnaldo Momigliano*, ed. by M. H. Crawford and C. R. Ligota, Warburg Institute Colloquia, 2 (London), pp. 15–31
- Grafton, Anthony, and Megan Williams. 2006. *Christianity and the Transformation of the Book: Origen, Eusebius, and the Library of Caesarea* (Cambridge, MA)
- Grant, Robert M. 1970. *Theophilus of Antioch. Ad Autolyicum* (Oxford)
- . 1980. *Eusebius as Church Historian* (Oxford)
- . 1988. *Greek Apologists of the Second Century* (London)
- Grat, F., and others. 1964. *Les Annales de Saint Bertin* (Paris)
- Gratwick, A. S. 1982. 'Ennius' *Annales*', in *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature*, II: *Latin Literature*, ed. by E. J. Kenney and W. V. Clausen (Cambridge), pp. 60–76
- Grayson, A. K. 1975. *Assyrian and Babylonian Chronicles*, Texts from Cuneiform Sources, 5 (Locust Valley, NY; repr. Winona Lake, IN, 2000)
- . 1980a. 'Assyria and Babylonia', *Orientalia*, n.s., 49: 140–94
- . 1980b. 'Königslisten und Chroniken. B. Akkadisch', in Ebeling and others 1980: 86–135
- Green, R. P. H. (ed.). 1991. *The Works of Ausonius* (Oxford)
- Green, Steven J. 2004. *Ovid, 'Fasti' 1: A Commentary* (Leiden)
- Grierson, Philip. 1937. *Les Annales de Saint-Pierre de Gand et de Saint-Amand* (Brussels)
- Gruen, Erich S. 1990. *Studies in Greek Culture and Roman Policy* (Leiden)
- . 1998. *Heritage and Hellenism: The Reinvention of Jewish Tradition* (Berkeley)
- Grumel, V. 1958. *La Chronologie* (Paris)
- Grundmann, Herbert. 1965. *Geschichtsschreibung im Mittelalter: Gattungen, Epochen, Eigenart*, 2nd edn, Deutsche Philologie im Aufriß, 3 (Göttingen)
- Guarducci, Margherita. 1978. *Epigrafia greca*, IV: *Epigrafi sacre pagane e cristiane* (Rome)
- Guenée, Bernard. 1973. 'Histoires, annales, chroniques: essai sur les genres historiques au Moyen Âge', *Annales: Économies, sociétés, civilisations*, 28: 997–1016
- von Gutschmid, Alfred 1858. 'Zur Kritik des Διαμερισμὸς τῆς γῆς', *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie*, 13: 377–408 = *Kleine Schriften des Alfred von Gutschmid*, V, ed. by Franz Rühl (Leipzig, 1894), pp. 240–73.
- . 1894. 'Untersuchungen über den Διαμερισμὸς τῆς γῆς und andere Bearbeitungen der Mosaischen Völkertafel', in *Kleine Schriften des Alfred von Gutschmid*, V, ed. by Franz Rühl (Leipzig), pp. 585–717
- Hagens, Graham. 2009. 'Syncretism and Ancient Chronology: Can Democritus Date the Buddha?', *Museion* (formerly *Echos du monde classique*), 53: 29–55
- de Halleux, A. 1978. 'La Chronique melkite abrégée du Ms. Sinäi Syr. 10', *Le Muséon*, 91: 5–44
- Hallier, Ludwig. 1892. *Untersuchungen über die Edessenische Chronik*, TU, 9. 1 (Leipzig)
- Hallo, William W. 1988. 'The Nabonassar Era and Other Epochs in Mesopotamian Chronology and Chronography', in *A Scientific Humanist: Studies in Memory of Abraham Sachs*, ed. by Erle Leichty, Maria de J. Ellis, and Pamela Gerardi, Occasional Publications of the Samuel Noah Kramer Fund, 9 (Philadelphia), pp. 175–90
- Halphen, Louis. 1903. *Recueil d'annales angevines et vendômoises* (Paris)
- . 1921. *Études critiques sur l'histoire de Charlemagne* (Paris)
- Hannah, Robert. 2005. *Greek and Roman Calendars: Constructions of Time in the Classical World* (London)
- Hanning, Robert. 1966. *The Vision of History in Early Britain from Gildas to Geoffrey of Monmouth* (New York)

- Hansen, William. 1996. *Phlegon of Tralles' Book of Marvels*, Exeter Studies in History (Exeter)
- Harding, Phillip. 1994. *Androtion and the 'Atthis'* (Oxford)
- Harmon, A. M. (ed. and trans.). 1913. *Octogenarians*, in *Lucian*, I, LCL, 162 (London)
- Harra, Amir. 1999. *The Chronicle of Zuqnin Parts III and IV, A.D. 488–775*, Mediaeval Sources in Translation, 36 (Toronto)
- Harrison, Kenneth. 1977–78. 'Epacts in Irish Chronicles', *Studia Celtica*, 12–13: 17–32
- Hay, Denys. 1977. *Annalists and Historians: Western Historiography from the Eighth to the Eighteenth Centuries* (London)
- Hayward, Paul Antony. 2010. 'Gervase of Canterbury', in Dunphy and others 2010: 691–92
- Hellmann, S. 1934. 'Das Fredegarproblem', *Historische Vierteljahrschrift*, 29: 36–92
- Hennessy, W. M. 1866. *Chronicum Scotorum*, Rolls Series, 46 (London)
- Herbert-Brown, Geraldine. 1994. *Ovid and the 'Fasti': An Historical Study* (Oxford)
- Hertzberg, Hugo. 1874. *Die Historien und die Chroniken des Isidor von Sevilla* (Berlin)
- . 1875. 'Über die Chroniken des Isidorus von Sevilla', *Forschungen zur Deutschen Geschichte*, 15: 289–360
- Higbie, Carolyn. 2003. *The Lindian Chronicle and the Greek Creation of their Past* (Oxford)
- Hillgarth, J. N. 1966. 'Coins and Chronicles: Propaganda in Sixth-Century Spain and the Byzantine Background', *Historia*, 15: 483–508
- . 1970. 'Historiography in Visigothic Spain', in *Settimane di Studio XVII* 1970: 261–311
- Hoffmann, H. 1958. *Untersuchungen zur karolingischen Annalistik*, Bonner Historische Forschungen, 10 (Bonn)
- Hoffner, Harry A. 1980. 'Histories and Historians of the Ancient Near East: The Hittites', *Orientalia*, n.s., 49: 283–332
- Hofmeister, Adolf (ed.). 1912. *Otonis episcopi Frisingensis Chronica sive Historia de duabus civitatibus*, MGH SRG in usum schol., 45 (Hannover)
- Holder-Egger, Oswald. 1876. 'Untersuchungen über einige annalistische Quellen zur Geschichte des fünften und sechsten Jahrhunderts III. Die Ravennater Annalen', *Neues Archiv*, 1: 215–368
- (ed.). 1894. *Lamperti monachi Hersfeldensis Opera*, MGH SRG in usum schol., 38 (Hannover)
- Holladay, Carl R. 1983. *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors*, I: *Historians*, Society of Biblical Literature Texts and Translations, 20, Pseudepigrapha, 10 (Chico, CA)
- . 1995. *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors*, III: *Aristobulus*, Society of Biblical Literature Texts and Translations, 39, Pseudepigrapha, 13 (Atlanta)
- Hoppe, Henrik (ed.). 1939–42. *Quinti Septimi Florentis Tertulliani, Apologeticum secundum utramque libri recensionem*, CSEL, 69 (Vienna)
- Hornblower, Simon. 2006. 'Herodotus' Influence in Antiquity', in Dewald and Marincola 2006: 306–18
- Horsfall, Nicholas. 1989. *Cornelius Nepos: A Selection, including the Lives of Cato and Atticus* (Oxford)
- Hoyland, R. 1991. 'Arabic, Syriac and Greek Historiography in the First Abbasid Century', *Aram*, 3: 217–39
- Hughes, Kathleen. 1972. *Early Christian Ireland: Introduction to the Sources*, The Sources of History: Studies in the Use of Historical Evidence (London)
- Hultsch, Friedrich. 1864. *Metrologorum scriptorum reliquiae*, 1 (Leipzig)
- Hunger, Herbert. 1978. *Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner*, 2 vols, Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft, 12. 5. 1–2 (Munich)



- Huttner, Ulrich. 2008. 'Von Maximinus Thrax bis Aemilianus', in *Die Zeit der Soldaten-Kaiser: Krise und Transformation des Römischen Reiches im 3. Jahrhundert n. Chr. (235–284)*, ed. by John Klaus-Peter, Udo Hartmann, and Thomas Gerhardt (Berlin), pp. 161–221
- Huxley, G. L. 1981. 'On the Erudition of George the Synkellos', *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy*, 81 C: 207–17
- . 1982. 'Problems in the *Chronography* of Eusebius', *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy*, 82 C: 183–96
- Huyse, Philip. 2006. 'Les Provinces romaines dans la grande inscription trilingue de Šabuhr 1<sup>er</sup> sur la Ka'ba-ye Zardošt', in *La 'Crise' de l'Empire romain de Marc Aurèle à Constantin*, ed. by Marie-Henriette Quet (Paris), pp. 308–28
- Jacoby, Felix. 1902. *Apollodors Chronik*, Philologische Untersuchungen, 16 (Berlin; repr. New York, 1973)
- . 1904. *Das Marmor Parium* (Berlin; repr. with extra material Chicago, 1980)
- . 1949. *Atthis: The Local Chronicles of Ancient Athens* (Oxford; repr. New York, 1973)
- Jakobs, Hermann. 1999. *Kirchenreform und Hochmittelalter, 1046–1215*, 4th edn, Oldenbourg Grundriss der Geschichte, 5 (Munich)
- Janiszewski, Paweł. 2006. *The Missing Link: Greek Pagan Historiography in the Second Half of the Third Century and in the Fourth Century AD*, Journal of Juristic Papyrology, Supplement 6 (Warsaw)
- Jeanjean, Benoît, and Bertrand Lançon. 2004. *Saint-Jérôme, 'Chronique', continuation de la 'Chronique' d'Eusèbe, années 326–378: suivie de quatre études sur les chroniques et chronographies dans l'Antiquité tardive (IV<sup>e</sup>–V<sup>e</sup> siècles)*. Actes de la table ronde du GESTIAT, Brest, 22 et 23 mars 2002 (Rennes)
- Jeffreys, Elizabeth. 1990a. 'Chronological Structures', in Jeffreys, Croke, and Scott 1990: 111–66
- . 1990b. 'Malalas' Sources', in Jeffreys, Croke, and Scott 1990: 167–216
- Jeffreys, Elizabeth, and others. 1986. *The Chronicle of John Malalas: A Translation*, Byzantina Australiensia, 4 (Melbourne)
- Jeffreys, Elizabeth, Brian Croke, and Roger Scott (eds). 1990. *Studies in John Malalas*, Byzantina Australiensia, 6 (Sydney)
- Johanson, S. F. 1979. "Scholar" at Work: The Compiling of the "Oxyrhynchus Chronicle" (P. Oxy. I, 12), in *Actes du XV<sup>e</sup> Congrès international de papyrologie*, III: *Problèmes généraux, Papyrologie littéraire*, ed. by Jean Bingen, Georges Nachtergaele, and E. G. Turner, Papyrologica Bruxellensia, 18 (Brussels), pp. 78–85
- Jones, Charles W. 1937. 'The "Lost" Sirmond Manuscript of Bede's "Computus"', *English Historical Review*, 52: 204–19
- . 1943. *Beda's Opera de temporibus* (Cambridge, MA); *De temporum ratione* repr. in *Beda Venerabilis, Opera didascalica*, II, CCSL, 123B (Turnhout, 1977) and *De temporibus* repr. in *Beda Venerabilis, Opera didascalica*, III, CCSL, 123C (Turnhout, 1980)
- . 1947. *Saints' Lives and Chronicles in Early England* (Ithaca; repr. 1968)
- Kaldellis, Anthony. 2004. *Procopius of Caesarea: Tyranny, History, and Philosophy at the End of Antiquity* (Philadelphia)
- Kalligas, Paul. 2001. 'Traces of Longinus' Library in Eusebius' *Praeparatio Evangelica*', *Classical Quarterly*, 51: 584–98
- Karayannopoulos, Johannes, and Günter Weiß. 1982. *Quellenkunde zur Geschichte von Byzanz (324–1453)*, 2 vols (Wiesbaden)

- Karst, Josef. 1911. *Eusebius Werke*, v: *Die Chronik aus dem Armenischen Übersetzt mit textkritischem Commentar*, GCS, 20 (Leipzig)
- Kazhdan, Alexander. 1999. With Lee F. Sherry and Christine Angelidi, *A History of Byzantine Literature (650–850)* (Athens)
- Kelly, J. N. D. 1975. *Jerome: His Life, Writings, and Controversies* (London)
- Kervyn de Lettenhove, Joseph Marie Bruno Constantin, Baron (ed.). 1867–77. *Oeuvres de Froissart: Chroniques*, 25 vols (Brussels)
- Kienast, Dietmar. 1996. *Römische Kaisertabelle: Grundzüge einer römischen Kaiserchronologie* (Darmstadt)
- Klaassen, Michael. 2010. 'Cassiodorus' *Chronica*: Text, Chronography, and Sources' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Pennsylvania)
- . 2012. 'The *Fasti Parisini*: An Independent Consular List from the Fifth Century', *Journal of Late Antiquity*, 5: 145–65
- Kokkinos, Nikos. 2009. 'Ancient Chronography, Eratosthenes and the Dating of the Fall of Troy', *Ancient West and East*, 8: 37–56
- Krüger, Karl Heinrich. 1976. *Die Universalchroniken*, Typologie des sources du Moyen Âge occidental, 16 (Turnhout)
- Krusch, Bruno. 1882. 'Die *Chronicae* des sogenannten Fredegar', *Neues Archiv*, 7: 247–351 and 421–516
- . 1884. 'Über eine Handschrift des Victurius', *Neues Archiv*, 9: 269–82
- Kuhr, Amélie. 1987. 'Berossus' *Babyloniaka* and Seleucid Rule in Babylonia', in *Hellenism in the East: The Interaction of Greek and Non-Greek Civilizations from Syria to Central Asia after Alexander*, ed. by Amélie Kuhrt and Susan Sherwin-White (London), pp. 32–56
- . 2002. 'Babylon', in *Brill's Companion to Herodotus*, ed. by Egbert J. Bakker, Irene J. F. de Jong, and Hans van Wees (Leiden), pp. 475–96
- Kulikowski, Michael. 2004. *Late Roman Spain and its Cities* (Baltimore)
- Kurze, Friedrich (ed.). 1890. *Reginonis abbas Prumiensis Chronicon cum continuatione Treverensi*, MGH SRG in usum schol., 50 (Hannover)
- . (ed.). 1895. *Annales regni Francorum inde ab a. 741 usque ad a. 829, qui dicuntur Annales Laurissenses maiores et Einhardi*, MGH SRG in usum schol., 6 (Hannover)
- Labande, Edmond-René. 1970. 'L'Historiographie de la France de l'Ouest aux X<sup>e</sup> et XI<sup>e</sup> siècles', in *Settimane di Studio XVII* 1970: 750–91
- Lacarra, J. M. 1945. 'Textos navarros del Códice de Roda', *Estudios de Edad Media de la Corona de Aragón*, 1: 193–283
- Lambert, W. G. 1976. 'Berossus and Babylonian Eschatology', *Iraq*, 38: 171–73
- Landes, Richard. 1988. 'Lest the Millennium be Fulfilled: Apocalyptic Expectations and the Pattern of Western Chronography 100–800 CE', in *The Use and Abuse of Eschatology in the Middle Ages*, ed. by Werner Verbeke, Daniel Verhelst, and Andries Welkenhuysen, Mediaevalia Lovaniensia, Series 1/Studia 15 (Leuven), pp. 137–211
- Lanfranchi, Giovanni B. 2000. 'The Ideological and Political Impact of the Assyrian Imperial Expansion on the Greek World in the 8th and 7th Centuries BC', in Aro and Whiting 2000: 7–34
- Laporte, J. 1951. 'Les Premières Annales de Fontenelle', in *Mélanges: Documents publiés et annotés*, Société de l'histoire de Normandie, 15<sup>e</sup> série (Rouen)
- . 1954. *Les Annales de l'abbaye Saint-Pierre de Jumièges, Chronique universelle des origines au XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Paris)

- Larrañaga Elorza, Koldo. 1993. 'El pasaje del pseudo-Fredegario sobre el dux franco de Cantabria', *Archivo Español de Arqueología*, 66: 177–206
- Lefèvre, Maurice. 1947. *Hippolyte: Commentaire sur Daniel*, SC, 14 (Paris)
- Lemerle, Paul. 1986. *Byzantine Humanism*, trans. by Helen Lindsay and Ann Moffatt (Canberra)
- Lendi, W. 1971. *Untersuchungen zur frühalemannischen Annalistik: Die Murbacher Annalen mit Edition*, Scriptorium Friburgense, 1 (Fribourg)
- Lenfant, Dominique. 2004. *Crésias de Cnide: La Perse, L'Inde, Autres Fragments*, Budé (Paris)
- Lentz, Augustus. 1867–68. *Herodiani Technici reliquae*, I–II, Grammatici graeci, 3. 1–2 (Leipzig; repr. Hildesheim, 1965)
- Liddel, Peter, and Andrew Fear (eds). 2010. *Historiae mundi: Studies in Universal History* (London)
- Liebeschuetz, Wolf. 2003. 'Pagan Historiography and the Decline of the Empire', in Marasco 2003: 177–218
- Linehan, Peter. 1993. *History and Historians of Medieval Spain* (Oxford)
- Löfstedt, Bengt. 1984. *Beati Liebanensis et Eterii Oxomensis adversus Elipandum libri duo*, CCCM, 59 (Turnhout)
- Luce, T. J. 1990. 'Livy, Augustus, and the Forum Augustum', in Raaflaub and Toher 1990: 123–38
- Luppe, Wolfgang. 2010. 'Korrekturen und Ergänzungen zur Leipziger Weltchronik', *Archiv für Papyrusforschung*, 56: 200–06
- Luraghi, Nino (ed.). 2001a. *The Historian's Craft in the Age of Herodotus* (Oxford)
- . 2001b. 'Introduction', in Luraghi 2001a: 1–15
- Mac Airt, Seán. 1951. *The Annals of Inisfallen (MS Rawlinson B503)* (Dublin)
- Mac Airt, Seán, and Gearóid Mac Niocaill. 1983. *The Annals of Ulster (to A.D. 1131) Part I: Text and Translation* (Dublin)
- Mac Niocaill, Gearóid. 1975. *The Medieval Irish Annals* (Dublin)
- MacLean, Simon. 2009. *History and Politics in Late Carolingian and Ottonian Europe: The 'Chronicle' of Regino of Prüm and Adalbert of Magdeburg*, Manchester Medieval Sources (Manchester)
- MacMullen, Ramsay. 1982. 'The Epigraphic Habit in the Roman Empire', *American Journal of Philology*, 103: 233–46
- . 1986. 'Frequency of Inscriptions in Roman Lydia', *ZPE*, 65: 237–38
- . 1988. *Corruption and the Decline of Rome* (New Haven)
- Mango, Cyril. 1975. 'The Availability of Books in the Byzantine Empire, AD 750–850', in *Byzantine Books and Bookmen* (Washington, DC): 29–45
- . 1978. 'Who Wrote the Chronicle of Theophanes?', *Zbornik Radova*, 18: 9–17
- . 1980. *Byzantium: The Empire of New Rome* (London)
- . 1990. *Nikephoros, Patriarch of Constantinople: Short History, Text, Translation and Commentary*, CFHB, 13 (Washington, DC)
- Mango, Cyril, and Roger Scott. 1997. *The Chronicle of Theophanes Confessor: Byzantine and Near Eastern History, AD 284–813* (Oxford)
- Marasco, Gabriele (ed.). 2003. *Greek and Roman Historiography in Late Antiquity: Fourth to Sixth Century A.D.* (Leiden)
- Marcovich, Miroslav. 1986. *Hippolytus*, III: 'Refutatio omnium haeresium', Patristische Texte und Studien, 25 (Berlin)
- . 1990. *Pseudo-Justinus: Cohortatio ad Graecos. De monarchia. Oratio ad Graecos*, Patristische Texte und Studien, 32 (Berlin)
- Marshall, P. K., and others. 1980. 'Clare College MS. 26 and the Circulation of Aulus Gellius 1–7 in Medieval England and France', *Mediaeval Studies*, 42: 353–94

- Martín, José Carlos. 2003. *Isidori Hispalensis Chronica*, CCSL, 112 (Turnhout)
- . 2006. *Scripta de vita Isidori Hispalensis episcopi*, CCSL, 113B (Turnhout)
- Mathisen, Ralph W., and Danuta Shanzer (eds). 2001. *Society and Culture in Late Antique Gaul: Revisiting the Sources* (Aldershot)
- Matthews, John F. 2000. *Laying Down the Law: A Study of the Theodosian Code* (New Haven)
- Mattingly, Harold, and Edward A. Sydenham. 1926. *The Roman Imperial Coinage*, II: *Vespasian to Hadrian* (London)
- Mattingly, Harold, Edward A. Sydenham, and C. H. V. Sutherland. 1949. *The Roman Imperial Coinage*, IV. 3, Gordian III – Uranius Antoninus (London)
- McCarthy, Daniel. 1998. 'The Status of the Pre-Patrician Irish Annals', *Peritia*, 12: 98–152
- . 2008. *The Irish Annals: Their Genesis, Evolution and History* (Dublin)
- McCormick, Michael. 1975. *Les Annales du haut Moyen Âge*, Typologie des sources du Moyen Âge occidental, 14 (Turnhout)
- McGuire, M. R. P. 1967. 'Annals and Chronicles', in *New Catholic Encyclopedia*, I (New York), pp. 551–56
- McKitterick, Rosamond. 1989. *The Carolingians and the Written Word* (Cambridge)
- (ed.). 1994. *Carolingian Culture: Emulation and Innovation* (Cambridge)
- . 2004. *History and Memory in the Carolingian World* (Cambridge)
- . 2008. *Charlemagne: The Formation of a European Identity* (Cambridge)
- Meier, Mischa. 2007. 'Natural Disasters in the *Chronographia* of John Malalas: Reflections on their Function — An Initial Sketch', *Medieval History Journal*, 10: 237–66
- Meiggs, Russell. 1973. *Roman Ostia* (Oxford)
- Merlet, R. 1896. *La Chronique de Nantes 570 environ–1049* (Paris)
- Meyer, Elizabeth A. 1990. 'Explaining the Epigraphic Habit in the Roman Empire: The Evidence of Epitaphs', *Journal of Roman Studies*, 80: 74–96
- Meyer-Gebel, Marlene. 1987. 'Zur annalistischen Arbeitsweise Hinkmars von Reims', *Francia*, 15: 75–108
- Michels, Agnes Kirsopp. 1967. *The Calendar of the Roman Republic* (Princeton)
- van de Mieroop, Marc. 1999. *Cuneiform Texts and the Writing of History* (London)
- Milburn, R. L. P. 1954. *Early Christian Interpretations of History* (New York)
- Milikowsky, Chaim. 2002. 'Josephus between Rabbinic Culture and Hellenistic Historiography', in *Shem in the Tents of Japhet: Essays on the Encounter of Judaism and Hellenism*, ed. by J. Kugel, *Journal for the Study of Judaism Supplement*, 74 (Leiden), pp. 159–200
- . 2006. 'Seder Olam', in *The Literature of the Sages. Second Part: Midrash and Targum, Liturgy, Poetry, Mysticism, Contracts, Inscriptions, Ancient Science, and the Languages of Rabbinic Literature*, ed. by Shmuel Safrai and others, *Compendia rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum*, 2. 3b (Assen), pp. 231–37
- . 2007. 'Justus of Tiberias and the Synchronistic Chronology of Israel', in *Studies in Josephus and the Varieties of Ancient Judaism: Louis H. Feldman Jubilee Volume*, ed. by S. J. D. Cohen and J. J. Schwartz, *Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*, 67 (Leiden): 103–26
- . Forthcoming. *Seder Olam: Text, Introduction and Commentary* [in Hebrew] (Jerusalem)
- Millar, Fergus. 1988. 'Cornelius Nepos, "Atticus" and the Roman Revolution', *Greece and Rome*, 35: 40–55
- Millard, Allan. 1994. With a contribution by Robert Whiting, *The Eponyms of the Assyrian Empire, 910–612 BC*, State Archives of Assyria Studies, series 2 (Helsinki)

- Minns, Denis, and Paul Parvis (eds and trans). 2009. *Justin, Philosopher and Martyr. Apologies*, Oxford Early Christian Texts (Oxford)
- Mirot, Léon, and Albert Mirot. 1957. *Chroniques de J. Froissart: Troisième livre*, vol. XIII, Société de l'histoire de France (Paris)
- Möller, Astrid. 2001. 'The Beginning of Chronography: Hellanicus' *Hiereiai*', in Luraghi 2001a: 241–62
- . 2004. 'Greek Chronographic Traditions about the First Olympic Games', in *Time and Temporality in the Ancient World*, ed. by Ralph M. Rosen (Philadelphia), pp. 169–84
- . 2005. 'Epoch-making Eratosthenes', *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies*, 45: 245–60
- Mommsen, Theodor. 1850. *Über den Chronographen vom J. 354*, Abhandlungen der Königlich Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften, phil.-hist. Classe, 1 (Leipzig), pp. 547–693
- (ed.). 1882. *Iordanis Romana et Getica*, MGH AA, 5. 1 (Berlin)
- (ed.). 1892. *Chronica minora*, I: saec. IV. V. VI. VII., MGH AA, 9 (Berlin)
- (ed.). 1894. *Chronica minora*, II: saec. IV. V. VI. VII., MGH AA, 11 (Berlin)
- (ed.). 1898. *Chronica minora*, III: saec. IV. V. VI. VII., MGH AA, 13 (Berlin)
- Mommsen, Th., and Paul M. Meyer (eds). 1905. *Theodosiani libri XVI cum Constitutionibus Sirmondianis et Leges novellae ad Theodosianum pertinentes* (Berlin)
- Moravcsik, Gyula. 1958. *Byzantinoturcica*, I: *Die byzantinischen Quellen der Geschichte der Türkvölker*, 2nd edn (Berlin)
- Morris, John. 1978. *Nennius: The British History and the Welsh Annals* (London)
- Mosshammer, Alden A. 1979. *The 'Chronicle' of Eusebius and Greek Chronographic Tradition* (Lewisburg, PA)
- . 1984. *Georgii Syncelli Ecloga Chronographica*, BT (Leipzig)
- . 2008. *The Easter Computus and the Origins of the Christian Era*, Oxford Early Christian Studies (Oxford)
- Mrozek, Stanislaw. 1973. 'À propos de la répartition chronologique des inscriptions latines dans le haut-empire', *Epigraphica*, 35: 113–18
- Muhlberger, Steven. 1984a. 'Heroic Kings and Unruly Generals: The "Copenhagen" Continuation of Prosper Reconsidered', *Florilegium*, 6: 50–70
- . 1984b. 'The Copenhagen Continuation of Prosper: A Translation', *Florilegium*, 6: 71–95
- . 1986. 'Prosper's *Epitoma Chronicon*: Was There an Edition of 443?', *CP*, 81: 240–44
- . 1990. *The Fifth-Century Chroniclers: Prosper, Hydatius, and the Gallic Chronicler of 452*, ARCA, 27 (Leeds)
- Müller, K. 1851. *Fragmenta historicorum Graecorum*, IV (Paris; repr. Frankfurt am Main, 1975)
- Murphy, Denis. 1896. *The Annals of Clonmacnoise* (Dublin)
- Murray, Alexander Callander. 2000. *From Roman to Merovingian Gaul: A Reader* (Peterborough, ON)
- Murray, Oswyn. 1970. 'Hecataeus of Abdera and Pharaonic Kingship', *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology*, 56: 141–71
- . 1993. *Early Greece*, 2nd edn (Cambridge, MA)
- . 2001a. 'Herodotus and Oral History', in Luraghi 2001a: 16–44 (originally published in *Achaemenid History*, II: *The Greek Sources*, ed. by H. Sancisi-Weerdenburg and A. Kuhrt (Leiden, 1987), pp. 93–115)
- . 2001b. 'Herodotus and Oral History Reconsidered', in Luraghi 2001a: 314–25
- Nautin, Pierre. 1947. *Hippolyte et Josipe: contribution à l'histoire de la littérature chrétienne du troisième siècle* (Paris)

- . 1961. *Lettres et écrivains chrétiens des I<sup>er</sup> et III<sup>e</sup> siècles*, Patristica, 2 (Paris)
- Nelson, Janet. 1991. *The Annals of St-Bertin: Ninth-Century Histories*, I, Manchester Medieval Sources (Manchester)
- Newton, Robert R. 1972. *Medieval Chronicles and the Rotation of the Earth* (Baltimore)
- Niese, Benedictus. 1888a. 'Die Chroniken des Hellanikos', *Hermes*, 23: 81–91
- . 1888b. 'Die Chronographie des Eratosthenes', *Hermes*, 23: 92–102
- Noble, Thomas F. X. 2009. *Charlemagne and Louis the Pious: Lives by Einhard, Notker, Ermoldus, Theagan, and the Astronomer* (University Park)
- Northwood, Simon. 2007. 'Quintus Fabius Pictor: Was He an Annalist?', in *Corolla Cosmo Rode-wald*, ed. by Nicholas Sekunda, Akanthina, 2 (Gdansk), pp. 97–114
- Nuove ricerche su Ippolito*. 1989. *Studia ephemeridis 'Augustinianum'*, 30 (Rome)
- Ó Cróinín, Dáibhí. 1983. 'Early Irish Annals from Easter Tables: A Case Restated', *Peritia*, 2: 74–86
- . 2003. *Early Irish History and Chronology* (Dublin)
- Oden, R. A., Jr. 1978. 'Philo of Byblos and Hellenistic Historiography', *Palestine Exploration Quarterly*, 110: 115–26
- O'Donnell, James J. 1979. *Cassiodorus* (Berkeley)
- O'Rahilly, T. F. 1946. *Early Irish History and Mythology* (Dublin)
- Ortiz de Urbina, Ignatius. 1958. *Patrologia Syriaca* (Rome)
- Ostrogorsky, George. 1969. *History of the Byzantine State* (New Brunswick, NJ)
- Otten, H. 1980. 'Königslisten. C. Bei den Hethitern', in Ebeling and others 1980: 135
- Paci, Gianfranco. 1981. 'Appendice epigraphica: Fasti consolari ed altri frammenti epigraphici dagli scavi del criptoportico di Urbisaglia (terza campagna, 1978)', *Notizie degli scavi di antichità*, 8th ser., 35: 60–69
- La Paléographie grecque et byzantine: Paris, 21–25 octobre 1974*. 1977. *Colloques internationaux du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique*, 559 (Paris)
- Palmer, Andrew. 1993. *The Seventh Century in the West-Syrian Chronicles*, TTH, 15 (Liverpool)
- Panchenko, Dmitri. 2000. 'Democritus' Trojan Era and the Foundations of Early Greek Chronology', *Hyperboreus*, 6: 31–78
- Parker, Grant. 2008. *The Making of Roman India* (Cambridge)
- Pasco-Pranger, M. 2002. 'Added Days: Calendrical Poetics and the Julio-Claudian Holidays', in *Ovid's 'Fasti': Historical Readings at its Bimillennium*, ed. by Geraldine Herbert-Brown (Oxford), pp. 251–74
- . 2006. *Founding the Year: Ovid's 'Fasti' and the Poetics of the Roman Calendar*, Mnemosyne Supplementum, 276 (Leiden)
- Pearson, Lionel. 1939. *Early Ionian Historians* (Oxford)
- . 1942. *The Local Historians of Attica*, Philological Monographs of the American Philological Association, 11 (Philadelphia)
- Pépin, Jean. 1955. 'Le "Challenge" Homère-Moïse aux premiers siècles chrétiens', *Revue des sciences religieuses*, 29: 105–22
- Pfeiffer, R. 1968. *History of Classical Scholarship from the Beginnings to the End of the Hellenistic Age* (Oxford)
- Pharr, Clyde. 1952. *The Theodosian Code and Novels and the Sirmondian Constitutions*, Corpus of Roman Law, 1 (Princeton)
- Pinsent, John. 1975. *Military Tribunes and Plebeian Consuls: The Fasti from 444 V to 342 V*, Historia Einzelschrift, 24 (Wiesbaden)

- Pizarro, Joaquin Martinez. 2005. *The Story of Wamba: Julian of Toledo's 'Historia Wambae regis'* (Washington, DC)
- Plummer, Charles. 1899. *Two of the Saxon Chronicles Parallel with Supplementary Extracts from the Others*, 2 vols (Oxford)
- Pognon, H. 1907. *Inscriptions sémitiques de la Syrie, de la Mésopotamie et de la région de Mossoul* (Paris)
- Poole, Reginald L. 1926. *Chronicles and Annals: A Brief Outline of their Origin and Growth* (Oxford)
- Popko, Lutz, and Michaela Rücker. 2011. 'P.Lips. Inv. 1228 und 590: Eine neue ägyptische Königsliste in griechischer Sprache', *Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde*, 138: 43–62
- Porzig, Wilhelm. 1937. 'Die Rezensionen der Etymologiae des Isidorus von Sevilla', *Hermes*, 72: 129–70
- Potter, David S. 1999. *Literary Texts and the Roman Historian* (London)
- Pouderon, Bernard. 2005. *Les Apologistes grecs du I<sup>er</sup> siècle* (Paris)
- Pouderon, Bernard, and others. 2009. *Pseudo-Justin: Ouvrages apologetiques*, SC, 528 (Paris)
- Pritchard, James B. 1955. *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*, 2nd edn (Princeton; 3rd edn, 1969)
- Proudfoot, A. S. 1974–75. 'The Sources of Theophanes for the Herakleian Dynasty', *Byzantion*, 44: 367–439
- Quasten, Johannes. 1960. *Patrology* 3 (Utrecht)
- Raaflaub, Kurt A. 2000. 'Influence, Adaptation, and Interaction: Near Eastern and Early Greek Political Thought', in Aro and Whiting 2000: 51–64
- Raaflaub, Kurt A., and Mark Toher (eds). 1990. *Between Republic and Empire: Interpretations of Augustus and his Principate* (Berkeley)
- Rackham, H. (ed. and trans.). 1952. Pliny, *Natural History*, IX: Books 33–35, LCL, 394 (London)
- Rawson, Elizabeth. 1985. *Intellectual Life in the Late Roman Republic* (London)
- Redford, Donald B. 1986. *Pharaonic King-Lists, Annals and Day-Books: A Contribution to the Study of the Egyptian Sense of History*, SSEA Publication, 4 (Mississauga)
- . (ed.). 2001. *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Ancient Egypt*, 3 vols (Oxford)
- Reuter, Timothy. 1992. *The Annals of Fulda: Ninth-Century Histories*, II, Manchester Medieval Sources (Manchester)
- Reydallet, Marc. 1966. 'La Diffusion des "Origines" d'Isidore de Séville au haut Moyen Âge', *Mélanges de l'École française de Rome*, 78: 383–437
- . 1970. 'Les Intentions idéologiques et politiques dans la *Chronique* d'Isidore de Séville', *Mélanges de l'École française de Rome*, 87: 363–400
- Reynolds, L. D. (ed.). 1983. *Texts and Transmission: A Survey of the Latin Classics* (Oxford)
- Reynolds, L. D., and N. G. Wilson. 1991. *Scribes and Scholars: A Guide to the Transmission of Greek and Latin Literature*, 3rd edn (Oxford)
- Ricerche su Ippolito*. 1977. *Studia ephemeridis 'Augustinianum'*, 13 (Rome)
- Rich, J. W. 1998. 'Augustus's Parthian Honours, the Temple of Mars Ultor and the Arch in the Forum Romanum', *Papers of the British School at Rome*, 66: 71–128
- Richardson, L., Jr. 1977. 'Hercules Musarum and the Porticus Philippi in Rome', *American Journal of Archaeology*, 81: 355–61
- . 1992. *A New Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome* (Baltimore)
- Riché, Pierre. 1979. *Les Écoles et l'enseignement dans l'Occident chrétien de la fin du V<sup>e</sup> siècle au milieu du XI<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Paris)

- Ridings, Daniel. 1995. *The Attic Moses: The Dependency Theme in Some Early Christian Writers*, *Studia Graeca et Latina Gothoburgensia*, 59 (Göteborg)
- Roberts, Michael. 1989. *The Jeweled Style: Poetry and Poetics in Late Antiquity* (Ithaca)
- Robinson, I. S. 2004. 'Reform and the Church, 1073–1122', in *The New Cambridge Medieval History*, IV: c. 1024–c. 1128, part 1, ed. by David Luscombe and Jonathan Riley-Smith (Cambridge), pp. 268–334
- Rodríguez Alonso, C. (ed.). 1975. *Las historias de los Godos, Vandalos, y Suevos de Isidoro de Sevilla: estudio, edición crítica y traducción* (León)
- Rollinger, Robert. 2000. 'Herodotus and the Intellectual Heritage of the Ancient Near East', in Aro and Whiting 2000: 65–83
- Rossi, Andreola, and Brian W. Breed. 2006. 'Introduction: Ennius and the Traditions of Epic', *Arethusa*, 39: 397–425
- Rouse, Richard, and Charles McNelis. 2000. 'North African Literary Activity: A Cyprian Fragment, the Stichometric Lists and a Donatist Compendium', *Revue d'histoire des textes*, 30: 189–238
- Ruck, Brigitte. 1996. 'Die Fasti von Taormina', *ZPE*, 111: 271–80
- Rüpke, Jörg. 1994. 'Ovids Kalenderkommentar: Zur Gattung der libri fastorum', *Antike und Abendland*, 40: 125–36
- . 1995a. 'Fasti: Quellen oder Produkte römischer Geschichtsschreibung?', *Klio*, 77: 184–202
- . 1995b. *Kalender und Öffentlichkeit: Die Geschichte der Repräsentation und religiösen Qualifikation von Zeit im Rom*, Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten, 40 (Berlin); trans. into English by David M. B. Richardson as *The Roman Calendar from Numa to Constantine: Time, History, and the 'Fasti'* (Chichester, 2011)
- . 1997. 'Geschichtsschreibung in Listenform: Beamtenlisten unter römischen Kalendern', *Philologus*, 141: 65–85
- . 2004. 'Acta aut legenda: Relations of Script and Performance', in Barchiesi, Rüpke, and Stephens 2004: 23–43
- . 2006. 'Ennius's *Fasti* in Fulvius's Temple: Greek Rationality and Roman Tradition', *Arethusa*, 39: 489–512
- Sabbah, Guy. 2003. 'Ammianus Marcellinus', in Marasco 2003: 43–84
- St John, Michael. 1999. *The Palermo Stone: An Arithmetical View*, 2nd edn (London)
- Salzman, Michele Renee. 1990. *On Roman Time: The Codex-Calendar of 354 and the Rhythms of Urban Life in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley)
- Samodurova, Z. G. 1961. 'Chronika Petra Aleksandrijskogo', *Vizantijskij Vremennik*, 18: 150–97
- Samuel, Alan E. 1972. *Greek and Roman Chronology: Calendars and Years in Classical Antiquity*, *Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft*, 1. 7 (Munich)
- Scaliger, J.-J. 1629. *Opus de emendatione temporum*, 3rd edn (Geneva)
- Scheid, John. 1992. 'Myth, Cult and Reality in Ovid's *Fasti*', *PCPS*, n.s., 38: 118–31
- Schenk, Kenneth. 2005. *A Brief Guide to Philo* (Louisville)
- Schmale-Ott, I. 1971. 'Untersuchungen zu Ekkehard von Aura und zur *Kaiserchronik*', *Zeitschrift für bayerische Landesgeschichte*, 34: 403–61
- Schmitt, John. 1904. *The Chronicle of Morea* (London)
- Schneider, Reinhard. 2001. *Das Frankenreich*, 4th edn, Oldenbourg Grundriss der Geschichte, 5 (Munich)
- Schnorr von Carolsfeld, H. 1911. 'Chronicon laurissense breve', *Neues Archiv*, 36: 13–39
- Schoene, Alfred (ed.). 1866. *Eusebi Chronicorum libri duo II: Eusebi Chronicorum canonum* (Berlin)



- (ed). 1875. *Eusebi Chronicorum libri duo 1: Eusebi Chronicorum liber prior* (Berlin)
- Scholz, Bernhard Walter. 1970. With Barbara Rogers, *Carolingian Chronicles* (Ann Arbor)
- Schöne, Alfred. 1900. *Die Weltchronik des Eusebius in ihrer Bearbeitung durch Hieronymus* (Berlin)
- Schreiner, Peter. 1975. *Die byzantinischen Kleinchroniken, I: Einleitung und Text*, Corpus fontium historiae byzantinae, 12. 1 (Vienna)
- . 1977. *Die byzantinischen Kleinchroniken, II: Historischer Kommentar*, Corpus fontium historiae byzantinae, 12. 2 (Vienna)
- Schulz, Marie. 1910. 'Zur Arbeitsweise Sigeberts von Gembloux im Liber de scriptoribus ecclesiasticis', *Neues Archiv*, 35: 563–71
- Schwartz, E. 1894–95. 'Die Königslisten des Eratosthenes und Kastor mit Excursen über die Interpolationen bei Africanus und Eusebios', *Abhandlungen der königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen*, phil.-hist. Klasse, 40. 2: 1–96
- Sciarrino, Enrica. 2004. 'A Temple for the Professional Muse: The *Aedes Herculis Musarum* and the Cultural Shifts in Second-Century B. C. Rome', in Barchiesi, Rüpke, and Stephens 2004: 45–56
- . 2006. 'The Introduction of Epic in Rome: Cultural Thefts and Social Contests', *Arethusa*, 39: 449–69
- Scott, James M. 2002. *Geography in Early Judaism and Christianity: The Book of Jubilees*, Society for New Testament Studies, Monograph series, 113 (Cambridge)
- Scott, Roger. 1990. 'Byzantine Chronicle Writing 2: The Byzantine Chronicle after Malalas', in Jeffreys, Croke, and Scott 1990: 38–54
- Schlmeier, Markus. 2003. 'Die Anfänge der antiquarischen Literatur in Rom', in Eigler and others 2003: 157–71
- Serruys, D. 1913. 'Les Canons d'Eusèbe, d'Annianus, et d'Andronicus d'après Élie de Nisibe', *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, 22: 1–36
- Settimane di Studio XVII: La Storiografia Altomedievale, 10–16 aprile 1969* (Spoleto, 1970)
- Ševčenko, Ihor. 1992. 'The Search for the Past in Byzantium around the Year 800', *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 46: 279–93
- (ed). 2011. *Chronographiae quae Theophanis continuati nomine fertur liber quo Vita Basilii imperatoris amplectitur*, CFHB, 42. 2 (Berlin)
- Sigrist, Marcel. 1988. *Isin Year Names*, Institute of Archaeology Publications, Assyriological Series, 2 (Berrien Springs)
- Simpson, Christopher J. 1993. 'The Original Site of the *Fasti Capitolini*', *Historia*, 42: 61–81
- von Simson, Bernhard (ed.). 1905. *Annales Mettenses Priores*, MGH SRG in usum schol., 10 (Hannover)
- (ed.). 1909. *Annales Xantenses et Annales Vedastini*, MGH SRG in usum schol., 12 (Hannover)
- Sirinelli, Jean. 1961. *Les Vues historiques d'Eusèbe de Césarée durant la période prénicéenne*, Université de Dakar faculté des lettres et sciences humaines, Publications de la section de langues et littératures, 10 (Dakar)
- Skutsch, Otto. 1985. *The 'Annals' of Q. Ennius* (Oxford)
- Smyth, A. P. 1972. 'The Earliest Irish Annals: Their First Contemporary Entries, and the Earliest Centres of Recording', *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy*, 72 C: 1–48
- . 1995. *King Alfred the Great* (Oxford)
- . 2002. *The Medieval Life of King Alfred the Great: A Translation and Commentary on the Text Attributed to Asser* (London)

- Southern, Richard. 1970. 'Presidential Address: Aspects of the European Tradition of Historical Writing 1: The Classical Tradition from Einhard to Geoffrey of Monmouth', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 5th ser., 20: 173–96
- . 1971. 'Presidential Address: Aspects of the European Tradition of Historical Writing 2: Hugh of St Victor and the Idea of Historical Development', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 5th ser., 21: 159–79
- . 1972. 'Presidential Address: Aspects of the European Tradition of Historical Writing 3: History as Prophecy', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 5th ser., 22: 159–80
- . 1973. 'Presidential Address: Aspects of the European Tradition of Historical Writing 4: The Sense of the Past', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 5th ser., 23: 243–63
- Speck, Paul. 1988. *Das geteilte Dossier: Beobachtungen zu den Nachrichten über die Regierung des Kaisers Herakleios und die seiner Söhne bei Theophanes und Nikephoros*, Poikila Byzantina, 9 (Bonn)
- van der Spek, Robartus J. 2003. 'Darius III, Alexander the Great and Babylonian Scholarship', in *A Persian Perspective: Essays in Memory of Heleen Sancisi-Weerdenburg*, ed. by Wouter Henkelman and Amélie Kuhrt, Achaemenid History, 13 (Leiden), pp. 289–346
- . 2008. 'Berossus as a Babylonian Chronicler and Greek Historian', in *Studies in Ancient Near Eastern World View and Society Presented to Marten Stol on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday, 10 November 2005, and his Retirement from the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam*, ed. by R. J. van der Spek, with the assistance of G. Haayer, F. A. M. Wiggermann, M. Prins, and J. Bilbija (Bethesda, MD), pp. 277–318
- Stählin, Otto, and Ludwig Früchtel (eds). 1960. *Clemens Alexandrinus: Stromata. Buch I–VI*, 3rd edn, GCS, 52 (Berlin)
- Staubach, Nikolaus. 1995. 'Christiana tempora: Augustin und das Ende der alten Geschichte in der Weltchronik Frechulfs von Lisieux', *Frühmittelalterliche Studien*, 29: 167–206
- Sterling, Gregory E. 1992. *Historiography and Self-Definition: Josephos, Luke-Acts, and Apologetic Historiography*, Novum Testamentum Supplements, 64 (Leiden)
- Stevenson, Jane. 1990. 'Malalas in Latin', in Jeffreys, Croke, and Scott 1990: 297–99
- Stevenson, W. H., and Dorothy Whitelock. 1959. *Asser's Life of King Alfred* (Oxford)
- Stokes, Whitley. 1895. 'The Annals of Tigernach', *Revue Celtique*, 16: 374–419
- . 1896. 'The Annals of Tigernach', *Revue Celtique*, 17: 6–33, 116–263, 337–420
- . 1897. 'The Annals of Tigernach', *Revue Celtique*, 18: 9–59, 150–97, 267–303, 374–91
- . 1993. *The Annals of Tigernach* (Lampeter); repr. of Stokes 1895, 1896, 1897
- Story, Joanna. 2005. 'The Frankish Annals of Lindisfarne and Kent', *Anglo-Saxon England*, 34: 59–109
- Stubbs, William (ed.). 1867. *Gesta regis Henrici secundi Benedicti abbatis. The Chronicle of the Reigns of Henry II and Richard I, AD 1169–1192; Known Commonly under the Name of Benedict of Peterborough I*, Rolls Series, 49 (London)
- (ed.). 1876. *Radulphi de Diceto decani Londoniensis, Opera historica. The Historical Works of Master Ralph de Diceto, Dean of London*, I, Rolls Series, 68 (London)
- Tadmor, Hayim. 1977. 'Observations on Assyrian Historiography', in *Essays on the Ancient Near East in Memory of Jacob Joel Finkelstein*, ed. by Maria de Jong Ellis, Memoirs of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences, 19 (Hamden, CT), pp. 209–13
- Taylor, Lily Ross. 1951. 'New Indications of Augustan Editing in the Capitoline *Fasti*', *CP*, 46: 73–80

- Taylor, Lily Ross, and Louise Adams Holland. 1952. 'Janus and the *Fasti*', *CP*, 47: 137–42
- Thackeray, H. St J. (ed. and trans.). 1926. Josephus, *The Life. Against Apion*, LCL, 186 (Cambridge, MA)
- . (ed. and trans.). 1930. Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities*, 1: *Books I–III*, LCL, 242 (Cambridge, MA)
- Thurn, Ioannes. 1973. *Ioannis Scylitzae Synopsis Historiarum*, CFHB, 5 (Berlin)
- . 2000. *Ioannis Malalae Chronographia*, CFHB, 35 (Berlin)
- Toye, David L. 1995. 'Dionysius of Halicarnassus on the First Greek Historians', *American Journal of Philology*, 116: 279–302
- Toynbee, Arnold. 1973. *Constantine Porphyrogenitus and his World* (London)
- Tracy, Stephen V. 2000. 'Demetrius of Phalerum: Who Was He and Who Was He Not?', in *Demetrius of Phalerum: Text, Translation and Discussion*, ed. by William W. Fortenbaugh and Eckart Schütrumpf, Rutgers University Studies in Classical Humanities, 9 (New Brunswick), pp. 331–45
- Treadgold, Warren. 1997. *A History of the Byzantine State and Society* (Stanford)
- . 2007. *The Early Byzantine Historians* (Basingstoke)
- Troiani, Lucio. 1983. 'Contributo alla problematica dei rapporti fra storiografia greca e storiografia vicino-orientale', *Athenaeum*, n.s., 71: 427–38
- . 1988. *Due studi di storiografia e religione antiche*, Biblioteca di Athenaeum, 10 (Como)
- Troncarelli, Fabio. 1989. 'Il consolato dell'Anticristo', *Studi Medievali*, 3rd ser., 30: 567–92
- Ungnad, Arthur. 1938a. 'Datenlisten', in Ebeling and Meissner 1938: 131–95
- . 1938b. 'Eponymen', in Ebeling and Meissner 1938: 412–57
- Van Nuffelen, Peter. 2010. 'Theology versus Genre? The Universalism of Christian Historiography in Late Antiquity', in Liddel and Fear 2010: 162–75
- Van Seters, John. 1981. 'Histories and Historians of the Ancient Near East: The Israelites', *Orientalia*, n.s., 50: 137–85
- . 1983. *In Search of History: Historiography in the Ancient World and the Origins of Biblical History* (New Haven)
- Vasiliev, A. 1942–43. 'Medieval Ideas of the End of the World: West and East', *Byzantion*, 16: 462–502
- Verbrugghe, Gerald P. 1989. 'On the Meaning of *Annales*, on the Meaning of Annalist', *Philologus*, 133: 192–230
- Verbrugghe, Gerald P., and John M. Wickersham. 1996. *Berosos and Manetho Introduced and Translated: Native Traditions in Ancient Mesopotamia and Egypt* (Ann Arbor)
- Vidier, A. 1965. *L'Historiographie à Saint-Benoît-sur-Loire* (Paris)
- Vidman, Ladislav. 1982. *Fasti Ostienses* (Prague)
- Vincent, John. 2006. *An Intelligent Person's Guide to History* (New York)
- Wacholder, Ben Zion. 1963. 'Pseudo-Eupolemus' Two Greek Fragments on the Life of Abraham', *Hebrew Union College Annual*, 34: 83–113 (repr. Wacholder 1976: 75–105)
- . 1968. 'Biblical Chronology in the Hellenistic World Chronicles', *Harvard Theological Review*, 61: 451–81 (repr. Wacholder 1974: 97–128; Wacholder 1976: 106–36)
- . 1974. *Eupolemus: A Study of Judaeo-Greek Literature* (Cincinnati)
- . 1976. *Essays on Jewish Chronology and Chronography* (New York)
- Wachsmuth, Curt. 1895. *Einleitung in das Studium der alten Geschichte* (Leipzig)
- Waddell, W. G. (ed. and trans.). 1940. *Manetho, History of Egypt and Other Works*, LCL, 350 (Cambridge, MA)

- Wahlgren, Staffan. 2006. *Symeonis Magistri et Logothetae Chronicon*, CFHB, 44. 1 (Berlin)
- Waitz, Georg (ed.). 1883. *Annales Bertiniani*, MGH SRG in usum schol., 5 (Hannover)
- Wallace-Hadrill, Andrew. 1987. 'Time for Augustus: Ovid, Augustus and the *Fasti*?' in *Homo Viator: Classical Essays for John Bramble*, ed. by Michael Whitby and others (Bristol), pp. 221–30
- . 2008. *Rome's Cultural Revolution* (Cambridge)
- Wallace-Hadrill, D. S. 1960. *Eusebius of Caesarea* (London)
- Wallace-Hadrill, J. M. 1960. *The Fourth Book of the Chronicle of Fredegar* (London)
- Wallis, Faith. 1999. *Bede: The Reckoning of Time*, TTH, 29 (Liverpool)
- Wallraff, Martin (ed.). 2006a. *Julius Africanus und die christliche Weltchronistik*, Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur, 157 (Berlin)
- . 2006b. 'Die neu Fragmentensammlung der Chronographie des Julius Africanus: Bemerkungen zur Methodik anhand einiger Dubia vel Spuria', in Wallraff 2006a: 45–59
- . 2007. With Umberto Roberto, Karl Pinggéra, and William Adler. *Iulius Africanus Chronographiae: The Extant Fragments*, GCS, n.s., 15 (Berlin)
- Wattenbach, Wilhelm, and others. 1952–90. *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen im Mittelalter*, 6 vols and 1 Beiheft (Weimar): vols I–VI continuously paginated, but cited here with vol. no.
- Wehrli, F. 1967a. *Die Schule des Aristoteles*, I: *Dikaiarchos*, 2nd edn (Basel)
- . 1967b. *Die Schule des Aristoteles*, II: *Aristoxenos*, 2nd edn (Basel)
- Weiß, Alexander. 2010. 'Die Leipziger Weltchronik — die älteste christliche Weltchronik?', *Archiv für Papyrusforschung*, 56: 26–37
- Weitzmann, Kurt. 1971. 'Book Illustration of the Fourth Century: Tradition and Innovation', in *Studies in Classical and Byzantine Manuscript Illumination*, ed. by Herbert L. Kessler (Chicago), pp. 96–125 (originally published in *Akten des VII. Internationalen Kongresses für Christliche Archäologie, Trier 1965*, Studi di Antichità Cristiana, 27 (Rome, 1969), pp. 257–81)
- Werner, Robert. 1963. *Der Beginn der römischen Republik: Historisch-chronologische Untersuchungen über die Anfangszeit der libera res publica* (Munich)
- West, M. L. 1989. *Iambi et Elegi Graeci ante Alexandrum Cantati*, I (Oxford)
- . 2000. 'Fable and Disputation', in Aro and Whiting 2000: 93–97
- Whitby, Michael. 1983a. 'The Great Chronographer and Theophanes', *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies*, 8: 1–20
- . 1983b. 'Theophanes' Chronicle Source for the Reigns of Justin II, Tiberius and Maurice (A.D. 565–602)', *Byzantion*, 53: 312–45
- . 1992. 'Greek Historical Writing after Procopius: Variety and Vitality', in Cameron and Conrad 1992: 25–80
- Whitby, Michael, and Mary Whitby. 1989. *Chronicon Paschale, 284–628 AD*, TTH, 7 (Liverpool)
- White, Hayden. 1987. *The Content of the Form: Narrative Discourse and Historical Representation* (Baltimore)
- Whitelock, Dorothy. 1968. *The Genuine Asser* (Reading)
- Whittaker, Molly (ed. and trans.). 1999. *Tatian: 'Oratio ad Graecos' and Fragments*, Oxford Early Christian Texts (Oxford)
- Whittow, Mark. 1996. *The Making of Byzantium, 600–1025* (Berkeley)
- Wickham, Chris. 2005. *Framing the Early Middle Ages* (Oxford)
- Wilcox, Donald J. 1987. *The Measure of Times Past: Pre-Newtonian Chronologies and the Rhetoric of Relative Time* (Chicago)
- Wilkinson, Toby A. H. 1999. *Early Dynastic Egypt* (London)

- . 2000. *Royal Annals of Ancient Egypt: The Palermo Stone and its Associated Fragments* (London)
- Williams, Robert Lee. 2005. *Bishop Lists: Formation of Apostolic Succession of Bishops in Ecclesiastical Crises* (Piscataway)
- Wilmart, A. 1938. 'L'Histoire Ecclésiastique composée par Hugues de Fleury et ses destinataires', *Revue Bénédictine*, 54: 293–305
- Wilson, Nigel G. 1973. *Mediaeval Greek Bookhands: Examples Selected from Greek Manuscripts in Oxford Libraries* (Cambridge, MA)
- . 1975. 'Books and Readers in Byzantium', in *Byzantine Books and Bookmen* (Washington, DC): 1–15
- Winterbottom, Michael. 1978. *Gildas: The Ruin of Britain and Other Documents* (London)
- Wiseman, T. P. 1979. *Clio's Cosmetics: Three Studies in Greco-Roman Literature* (Leicester)
- . 2007. 'Review of Gary Forsythe, *A Critical History of Early Rome: From Prehistory to the First Punic War* (Berkeley 2005)', *CP*, 102: 236–40
- Witakowski, Witold. 1984–86. 'Chronicles of Edessa', *Orientalia Suecana*, 33–35: 487–98
- . 1987. *The Syriac Chronicle of Pseudo-Dionysius of Tel-Mahre: A Study in the History of Historiography* (Uppsala)
- . 1996. *Pseudo-Dionysius of Tel-Mahre: Chronicle (known also as the Chronicle of Zuqnin), Part III*, TTH, 22 (Liverpool)
- Witte, Robert. 1974. *Catalogus Sigeberti Gemblacensis monachi de viris illustribus: Kritische Ausgabe* (Bern)
- Wolf, Kenneth Baxter. 1999. *Conquerors and Chroniclers of Early Medieval Spain*, 2nd edn, TTH, 9 (Liverpool)
- Wolfson, Harry Austryn. 1968. *Philo: Foundations of Religious Philosophy in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam*, Structure and Growth of Philosophical Systems from Plato to Spinoza, 2 (Cambridge, MA)
- Wood, Jamie Peter. 2007. 'The Chronicles of Isidore of Seville' (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Manchester)
- Yannopoulos, Panayotis A. 1989. 'Théophane abrégé au X<sup>e</sup> siècle', *Byzantina*, 15: 307–14
- Yardley, J. C., and Anthony A. Barrett. 2011. *Velleius Paterculus, The Roman History from Romulus and the Foundation of Rome to the Reign of the Emperor Tiberius* (Indianapolis)
- Yon, Jean-Baptiste, and Pierre-Louis Gatier. 2009. *Choix d'inscriptions grecques et latines de la Syrie*, Guides archéologiques de l'Institut français du Proche-Orient, 6 (Amman)
- Young, Frances M. 1997. *Biblical Exegesis and the Formation of Christian Culture* (Cambridge)
- . 1999. 'Greek Apologists of the Second Century', in Edwards, Goodman, and Price 1999: 81–104
- Zanker, Paul. 1988. *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus* (Ann Arbor)
- Zellentin, Holger M. 2008. 'The End of Jewish Egypt: Artapanus and the Second Exodus', in *Antiquity in Antiquity: Jewish and Christian Pasts in the Greco-Roman World*, ed. by Gregg Gardner and Kevin L. Osterloh, Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism, 123 (Tübingen), pp. 27–73
- Zerubavel, Eviatar. 2003. *Time Maps: Collective Memory and the Social Shape of the Past* (Chicago)
- Zetzel, James E. G. 2007. 'The Influence of Cicero on Ennius', in Fitzgerald and Gowers 2007: 1–16



## INDEX

This index does not include any names within the text of chronicles quoted in translation, either in the text itself or in the appendices.

Works of known authors are cited under the author's name.

With very few exceptions Romans are listed under their *gentilicium*.

- Abraham  
 as cultural benefactor, 105, 107–8  
 as first Christian, 110–11, 120, 124, 125, 128  
 birth of, as chronological linchpin, 31, 40, 106  
 n27, 120 nn82–83, 123, 124, 125, 128, 130,  
 185, 200, 205, 229, 255, 271–2, 330  
 years of, *see* 'chronological systems'
- Achantia, and *Descriptio consulum*, 177, 178
- acta triumphorum, 170
- Acta triumphorum Barberiniana, 167
- Acta triumphorum Capitolina, 157, 161–2,  
 163, 164 n83, 167, 170
- Acta triumphorum Urbisalviensia, 167
- Adalbero of Augsburg, dedicatee of Regino of  
 Prüm, 255
- Additamenta ad Prosperum Havniensia*, *see*  
 'Consularia Hafniensia'
- Ademar of Chabannes, historical works of, 258  
 and legend of St Martial, 289
- Ado of Vienne, universal chronicle of, 254
- aedes Herculis Musarum*, 140–4, 159, 373–4  
 and Camenae, 141, 143
- Aegospotami, meteorite at, 85, 122
- Aelius Tubero, late republican historian, 93
- Agnellus, Andreas, *Liber pontificalis ecclesiae  
 Rauennatis*, 263  
 use of consularia by, 54, 179
- Akitu Chronicle, Babylonian, 75 n35, 76
- Albeldense*, *see* 'Chronica Albeldense'
- Alexander Polyhistor, Greek compiler  
 as source for earlier historians, 104, 107, 112,  
 113, 340  
 used by Eusebius, 339, 343, 353
- Alexandrian *chronographia* and *consularia*, 50,  
 54–5, 179, 181, 226 n93  
 historians and chronographers, 75 n37, 83–4,  
 86, 106, 107, 108, 229, 233 n117, 282  
 Easter cycle, 230 n105
- Alfonsine chronicle, 251  
*see also* 'Chronica Albeldense' and 'Chronica  
 Rotense'
- Alfred, king of Wessex, 207–8
- Anales Castellanos Primeros* and *Segundos*, 252
- Anastasius Bibliothecarius, translator of  
 Theophanes into Latin, 231 n111
- Andron of Alexandria, probable Greek chrono-  
 icler, 282
- Andronicus, modifier of Eusebian chrono-  
 graphy, 125

- Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, 21, 207–8, 253, 257  
*Annales Alamannici*, 248  
*Annales Aquenses*, 248  
*Annales Argentinenses*, 260 n202  
*Annales Augienses*, 248  
*Annales Auscienses*, 248  
*Annales Austriae*, 260 n202  
*Annales Babenburgenses*, 260 n202  
*Annales Barcinonenses*, 252 n177  
*Annales Barenses*, 253 n181  
*Annales Beneuentani*, 253 n181  
*Annales Bertiniani*, 239 n140, 244–5, 246, 251  
*Annales Blandinienses*, 248, 259 n199  
*Annales Bohemiae breuissimi*, 260 n203  
*Annales Bremenses*, 260 n202  
*Annales Brunwilarenses*, 268 n229  
*Annales Casinates*, 253 n181  
*Annales Cauenses*, 253 n181  
*Annales Colonienses*, 248  
*Annales Corbeienses*, 248  
*Annales Cremonenses*, 253 n181  
*Annales Elmarenses*, 259 n199  
*Annales Elnonenses*, 259 n199  
*Annales Engolismenses*, 248  
*Annales Fiscanenses*, 248  
*Annales Flauiniacenses*, 248  
*Annales Floriacenses*, 248, 257–8  
*Annales Fontanellenses*, 248  
*Annales Fossenses*, 248  
*Annales Fuldenses*, 244–6  
*Annales Gemmeticenses*, 260  
*Annales Gengenbacenses*, 260 n202  
*Annales Guelferbytani*, 248  
*Annales Iburgenses*, 248  
*Annales Iuuauenses/Annals of Kent and Northumbria*, 1, 3, 18 n34, 56, 184, 248  
*Annales Laubacenses*, 248  
*Annales Laubienses*, 248  
*Annales Laudunenses*, 248  
*Annales Laureshammenses*, 246 n163, 248  
*Annales Laurisenses maiores*, see ‘*Annales regni Francorum*’  
*Annales Lausonenses*, 248  
*Annales Lemouicenses*, 248  
*Annales Leodienses*, 248  
*Annales Lugdunenses*, 248  
*Annales Lundenses*, 260  
*Annales Lupi Protospatarii*, 253 n181  
*Annales Magdeburgenses*, 260 n202  
*Annales Marbacenses*, 260 n202  
*Annales Marchianenses*, 248  
*Annales Masciacenses*, 248  
*Annales Maurimonasterienses*, 260 n202  
*Annales maximi*  
     as Augustan compilation, 93, 94, 375  
     as primitive Roman historical compilation, 160 n74, 294  
     not like medieval annals, 5 n9, 18 n. 35, 93 n. 100  
*Annales Maximiniani*, 248  
*Annales Mettenses priores*, 248, 249  
*Annales Moguntini*, 260 n202  
*Annales Mosellani*, 248  
*Annales Nazariani*, 248  
*Annales Niuernenses*, 248  
*Annales Ottenburani*, 260 n202  
*Annales Petauiani*, 248  
*Annales Prumienses*, 248  
*Annales Rainaldi Archidiaconi*, 258 n193  
*Annales regni Francorum*, 239 n140, 243–6, 251, 255  
     as chronicle, 21, 26, 60, 290  
     named by Leopold von Ranke, 244, 290  
     source of Ademar of Chabannes, 258  
*Annales Remenses*, 248  
*Annales Rothomagenses*, 259–60  
*Annales S. Aegidii Brunswicensis*, 260 n202  
*Annales S. Albani Andecauensis*, 258 n193  
*Annales S. Amandi*, 248  
*Annales S. Amandi breues*, 248  
*Annales S. Bauonis*, 267 n228  
*Annales S. Benigni Diuionensis*, 259  
*Annales S. Columbae Senonensis*, 248  
*Annales S. Dionysii*, 248  
*Annales S. Emmerammi*, 248  
*Annales S. Germani*, 248  
*Annales S. Medardi Suessionensis*, 267 n228  
*Annales S. Quintini Veromandensis*, 248  
*Annales S. Sergii Andecauensis*, 258 n193  
*Annales S. Stephani Cadomensis*, 260 n201



- Annales S. Victoris Massiliensis*, 258–9  
*Annales Salisburgenses*, 248  
*Annales Sangallenses*, 45 n71, 248  
*Annales Scafhusesens*, 260 n202  
*Annales Sithiensens*, 248  
*Annales Spirenses*, 260 n202  
*Annales Tiliani*, 248  
*Annales Vedastini*, 239 n140, 248  
*Annales Vindocinenses*, 258 n193  
*Annales Viridunenses*, 248  
*Annales Vticensens*, 260  
*Annales Weingartenses*, 248  
*Annales Weissemburgenses*, 248  
*Annales Wirziburgenses*, 248  
*Annales Wormatienses*, 260 n202  
*Annales Xantenses*, 248
- annalistic histories, different from annals and chronicles, 19, 66 n8, 81, 82, 83, 93–4, 155, 157, 189 n1, 294 n8, 375
- annalistic structure, as a key characteristic of chronicles, 20, 23–4, 25, 26, 29, 30, 31, 32, 45, 57, 59, 60, 64, 129, 187, 203, 208, 225, 226, 228, 230, 234, 236 n133, 240, 247, 256, 271, 272, 337
- annals
- alleged medieval origin in Easter tables, 1–6, 35, 55 n90, 56, 57, 247, 358–9
  - as defined by classicists, 18, 19, 93–4, 271, 375
  - as defined by medievalists, 1–5, 11, 12–13, 14–17, 29, 189, 240, 246, 271, 272, 289–90, 358–9
  - as defined by Near Eastern scholars, 18, 66, 78, 79 n48, 271
  - can be called paschal chronicles, 19 n37, 55, 56, 60, 247, 272
  - defined as sub-genre of chronicles, 1 n1, 2–4, 12–20, 21, 59–60, 62, 189, 240, 249, 271–2
  - similarities with *consularia*, 11, 12 n13, 16, 39, 42, 53
  - similarities with *limmu* lists, 70
  - word, as used, or not, in the Middle Ages, 13–15, 59, 240, 288–96
  - word, as used by Romans, 8 n13, 11 nn18 and 20, 94, 288, 291, 292–5
  - see also specific texts under '*Annales*' and '*Annals of*'
- Annals of Bermondsey*, 257 n190  
*Annals of Boyle*, 211, 212, 213, 214  
*Annals of Burton-on-Trent*, 257  
*Annals of Clonmacnoise*, 212, 213, 214, 215, 220  
*Annals of Dunstable*, 257 n190  
*Annals of Fleury*, see '*Annales Floriacenses*'  
*Annals of Fulda*, see '*Annales Fuldenses*'  
*Annals of Inisfallen*, 210, 212, 213, 214, 215  
*Annals of Lorsch*, see '*Annales Laureshamnenses*'  
*Annals of Osney*, 257 n190  
*Annals of Roscrea*, 211, 212, 213, 214  
*Annals of St Bertin*, see '*Annales S. Bertiniani*'  
*Annals of St Gall*, see '*Annales Sangallenses*'  
*Annals of Tewkesbury*, 257 n190  
*Annals of the Four Masters*, 213, 220  
*Annals of Tigernach*, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 220  
*Annals of Ulster*, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214–15  
*Annals of Waverley*, 257 n190  
*Annals of Winchester*, 257 n190  
*Annals of Worcester*, 257 n190
- Annianus, early fifth-century Alexandrian chronographer, 125, 229, 369  
 and eschatology, 115 n64
- Anonymus Matritensis*, 32, 62, 233 n117  
*Anonymus Valesianus* (*pars posterior*), *Consularia Italica* as source of, 43, 54, 179, 183
- Anselm of Gembloux, completed and published final edition of Sigebert's chronicle, 266
- Anselm of Havelberg, on the meaning of *chronica* and *Annales*, 292 n6
- Antichrist, see 'Christ'
- Antileon, probable classical or Hellenistic chronicler, 280
- antiquarianism of epigraphic and manuscript calendars and fasti, 141–2, 144, 145, 149–50, 151, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 166, 170
- antiquarians and antiquarianism in the late Republic and early Empire, 18 n35, 91–3, 96, 136, 145, 154, 155, 156, 163, 164
- apocalypticism, 114–17

- Apollodorus, Χρονικά, 18 n34, 87–8, 89, 91, 92 n95, 95, 103 n15, 112, 127, 280, 281–2, 284, 344 n2, 349, 353, 363, 380
- Ps-, on the name of the Castor's chronicle, 88 n84
- apologetic chronography, 30, 99, 112–14, 116–17, 119–20, 122, 124, 125, 131, 337, 366
- apologetic
- Babylonian, 104–5
  - Christian, 99, 110–14, 116–17, 119–21, 122, 123, 124, 125, 131, 337, 365–6
  - Egyptian, 103–4
  - historical/cultural, 99–110, 131, 336
  - Jewish, 99, 105–10
  - Phoenician, 105
- archons, *see* 'chronological systems'
- Ardo of Aniane, his use of *Annales*, 290
- Arik-den-ili chronicle, Assyrian, 72
- Aristion, probable Greek chronicler, 280 n6
- Aristobulus, Jewish philosopher, 106, 108
- Aristonymos, probable Greek chronicler, 280 n6
- Artapanus, Jewish historian, 107, 108, 113 n55
- influenced by Hecataeus, 103–4
- Arval Brethren, use of dates AUC by, 136
- Asinius Quadratus, on date of foundation of Rome, 371
- Asser, *Life of Alfred*, 208
- Asshur-resha-ishi chronicle, Assyrian, 72
- Assyrian kings, 41, 68, 70, 71, 88, 186, 337, 339, 340, 364
- astronomical diaries, Babylonian, 78, 363
- Ateius Philologus, L., *Breviarium*, 96–7
- Athenaeus, second-century author of *Deipnosophistae*, 279 n2, 280 n3, 342 n9, 363
- Atthis/Atthides*, 81, 83, 84, 88, 357
- Atticus, *see* 'Pomponius Atticus, T.'
- Auctuarium Prosperi Havniense*, *see* 'Consularia Hafniensia'
- Augustine, bishop of Hippo
- quotes a local chronicle, 51 n80
  - six ages of the world of, 199, 200, 254
  - uses Jerome's *Chronici canones*, 286
- Aulus Gellius, *see* 'Gellius, Aulus'
- Aulus Hirtius, *see* 'Hirtius, Aulus'
- Aurelius Victor, Sextus, *Liber de Caesaribus* as *breviarium* not chronicle, 23, 61, 195, 197
- Byzantine analogues of, 31
  - on date of foundation of Rome, 371
- Ausonius, Decimius Magnus
- and date of foundation of Rome, 372
  - and fasti, 33 n52
  - and his chronicle, 98 n112, 128, 129 n104, 348–9
  - and Nepos's *Chronica*, 96 n109, 128, 178, 282
- Autocharis, probable Greek chronicler, 280
- Aventinus, fifth-century epitaph of, 135
- Babylon and Babylonia, 8, 20, 35, 71, 72–5, 77, 104, 339, 340, 362
- Babylonian Captivity, as chronological linchpin, 118, 200, 380
- Babylonians, 101, 107, 336, 339, 362
- Bamboo Annals, *see* 'Zhushu jinian'
- Bar Hebraeus, *Chronicon* of, 376
- Barbarus Scaligeri*, *see* 'Chronographia Scaligeriana'
- Bede, English historian, 204–7, 237, 256, 263–4
- and *anni Domini*, 2 n2, 18 n34, 207, 266
  - and *anni mundi*, 130–1, 206, 207
  - chronicle epitomes of, 1 n1, 23, 30, 31, 32, 57, 60–1, 62, 98, 191, 192, 193, 204, 205–7, 208, 215, 221, 226, 238, 239 n140, 241, 242, 243, 247, 253, 254, 257, 261, 262, 263–4, 265, 268, 273
  - De temporibus*, 32, 187, 205, 206
  - De temporum ratione*, 32, 187, 205–6, 237, 247, 248, 255, 268 nn229–30
  - and Easter tables, 1, 3, 205
  - and his use of Hebrew chronology for the OT, 110, 205, 206
  - Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum*, 13 n24, 18 n34, 191, 204, 256
  - and Irish chronicles, 208, 210, 213, 215, 220, 221
- Benferhat, Yasmina, 349
- Berosus, *Babyloniaca*, 103, 104, 108, 362–3
- and Leipzig chronograph, 339, 342
  - quoted by Eusebius, 344
  - used by Christian authors, 112, 113

- biography, 183, 195, 201, 263, 289  
   disappears at the end of antiquity, 191, 239  
   nature of, 22, 27, 28, 128  
   reappears in Carolingian period, 201, 239, 245  
     n157, 246, 256  
   Roman history becomes, 127  
 Brega, locus of composition of early version of  
   Irish chronicle, 216  
*breviaria*  
   Byzantine, 30–1, 32, 61–2, 181, 223, 224,  
     228, 232, 233, 254, 285  
   early medieval Latin, 183, 194, 195, 197, 198,  
     202, 226, 238, 240–3, 244, 253 n180, 289  
   nature of, 23, 32, 61–2, 96  
   Roman imperial and late Roman, 23, 31, 49  
     n77, 58, 61, 96–8, 127 n101, 201, 238, 286  
*Breviarium Vindobonense*, 97–8  
 brevity, as a key characteristic of chronicles, 17,  
   19, 22, 23, 25–7, 29, 43, 44–5, 51, 59, 60–1,  
   73–4, 98, 121, 183, 190, 199, 226, 231, 234,  
   240, 249, 256, 271, 272  
*Byzantino-Arabic Chronicle*, see 'Chronicle of 741'  
 calendar, 137–55  
   and antiquarianism, 141–2, 144, 145, 149,  
     150, 151, 153, 154, 155, 156, 170  
   Caesar's reform of, 140, 150 n53, 154  
   commentaries, 141, 142 n26, 144, 154, 156,  
     170, 374  
   defined, 10–12, 273  
   Egyptian, 63  
   epigraphic and painted, 52, 138–48, 149–50,  
     151–2, 153, 154–5, 159, 374  
   and fasti/consularia, 137, 141, 143, 144, 145,  
     146, 155, 156, 158, 159, 166 n91, 167, 169,  
     170, 175, 374  
   honours Augustus and Tiberius in the East,  
     154  
   imperial and imperial events added to, 46,  
     150–5, 181  
   not officially compiled or published, 146–50,  
     152–3, 154, 156, 158, 159, 172  
   of *Chronograph of 354*, 148–50  
   of M. Fulvius Nobilior, 140–4, 147, 148, 155,  
     159, 374–5  
   of M. Verrius Flaccus, 144–5, 147, 148, 154,  
     155, 374  
   of Polemius Silvius, 148–50  
   and Ovid, 10, 12, 149 n49, 150 n50, 154–55,  
     272  
   and pontifex maximus, 167 n92  
   and Sulla, 151  
   calendar year, defined, 38 n63, 372  
   Callisthenes, Greek historian, 362  
   Calpurnius Piso Censorius Frugi, L., Roman  
     historian, 92, 136 n5  
   Carthage, *Descriptio consulum* and, 50–1, 177  
   Cassian, Greek chronographer, 111 n52, 286  
     n22, 365–6, 380  
   Cassiodorus  
     *Chronica*, 3, 11, 39, 179, 187, 194, 263, 264,  
       360  
     as expanded consularia, 5 n9, 36, 41–2, 42–3,  
       53, 58, 183, 186  
     defines *chronica*, 19, 20, 21, 25–6, 287  
     *Historia Tripartita*, 199, 201, 204  
   Cassius Dio, second-century Greek historian,  
     history of, described as chronicle, 285  
     on Caesar's calendar, 150 n51  
   Cassius Hemina, Roman historian, 92 n95, 136  
     not identical with Cassius Longinus, 349  
     on date of foundation of Rome, 355, 371  
   Cassius Longinus, Greek Imperial Olympiad  
     chronicler, 89–90, 284, 343–9, 352  
   Castor of Rhodes, 'Ἐπιτομὴ χρονικῶν', 88, 89,  
     90 n90, 95, 106 n24, 128, 170, 282, 352,  
     364–5  
     and Africanus, 112 n54, 350  
     and Eusebius, 101 n9, 343, 352 n15, 364–5,  
       380  
     mentioned by Ausonius, 96 n109, 128  
     Καὶνών, 88 n85, 341  
     and Thallus, 112 n54, 350  
   Cato, Roman writer, see 'Porcius Cato, M.'  
   Cedrenus, Σύνοψις ιστοριῶν  
     as *breviarium*, 30, 62  
     use of Theophanes by, 231 n111  
   Censorinus, *De die natali*  
     on date of foundation of Rome, 371  
     on equivalence of *annales* and ὥροι, 80 n51

## censors

- appear with consuls in fasti, 33, 37, 141, 142 n25, 143, 156, 159–60, 161 n76, 166, 167, 171–2, 272, 375
- of Ostia in Fasti Ostienses, 168, 169
- Chaldaeans, confusion for Babylonians, 103, 339, 340, 362
- Charax, probable Greek chronicler, 282
- Charon of Lampsacus, Greek horographer, 80–1, 362
- Childebrand, and 'Fredegar chronicle', 241–3
- Chinese chronicles, *see* 'Zhushu jinian'
- Christ, Antichrist, 115–16, 366
- birth of (Incarnation), 115, 116, 117, 119, 125, 205, 206, 218, 225, 229–30, 254, 369, 370
- as chronological linchpin, 28, 130, 185, 255, 260, 262, 267, 268 n 30, 272
- see also* 'anni ab incarnatione' and 'anni Domini', under 'chronological systems'
- death of (Crucifixion), date of, 115 n61, 350–1, 381–2
- as chronological linchpin, 31, 38 n62, 57, 60, 115, 130, 185, 369, 370
- see also* 'anni a passione', under 'chronological systems'
- return of (*Parousia*), 34, 114–16, 117, 229
- Christesen, Paul, 17–18 n34, 88 n84, 343, 344–5, 346, 379, 380–1
- Christian apologetic and apologists, *see* 'apologetic, Christian'
- Christian chronicles and chroniclers, *see* 'chronicles, Christian'
- Christian fundamentalists, modern, and the creation of the world, 110
- Christian history and historical perspective, 78, 127, 206–7, 255
- see also* various Christian dating systems under 'chronological systems'
- Christianity, brings chronography to Ireland, 209–10, 221
- chronica/χρονικά, origin of the word, 89, 278–87
- Chronica Albeldense*, 251
- Chronica Boemorum*, *see* 'Cosmas of Prague'
- Chronica Caesaraugustana*, *see* 'Consularia Caesaraugustana'
- Chronica Riipullensia*, 252
- Chronica Rotense*, 251
- Chronica S. Benedicti Casinensis, breviarium*, not chronicle, 253 n180
- Chronica urbis Romae*, *see* 'Breviarium Vindobonense'
- chronicle epitomes
- compared to Byzantine *breviaria*/epitomes, 30, 62, 225, 226, 254
- defined, 31–2, 60–1, 192–3
- in Carolingian period, 237, 253–4, 256, 257, 258, 259, 262–3, 268
- in chronicle of Cassiodorus, 58
- works of Isidore and Bede described as, 1 n1, 23, 32, 41, 57, 98, 130–1, 187, 191–3, 194, 199, 200, 204 n42, 205, 206, 210, 221, 233 n17, 237, 238, 239 n140, 241, 242, 253, 255, 261, 263, 268, 273, 359, 377
- Chronicle of 741 (Byzantino-Arabic Chronicle)*, 202–3
- Chronicle of 754*, 202–3
- Chronicle of Early Kings, Babylonian, 76
- Chronicle of Ireland, hypothetical early Irish chronicle, 212–13, 217, 219
- Chronicle of Market Prices, Babylonian, 75, 76
- Chronicle of the Morea*, 235
- Chronicle of the Single Monarchy, Sumerian 'chronicle', 67–8, 102 n12
- Chronicle of Zuqnin /Chronicle of Ps.-Dionysius of Tel-Mahre*, Syriac chronicle, 376
- Chronicle P, Babylonian chronicle, 71, 76
- Chronicle to the Year 724*, Syriac chronicle, 376
- Chronicle to the Year 819*, Syriac chronicle, 376
- Chronicle to the Year 846*, Syriac chronicle, 376
- Chronicle to the Year 1234*, Syriac chronicle, 376
- chronicles
- Arabic, 227
- Armenian, 227
- Assyrian, 5 n9, 7, 8, 10, 17, 20, 24, 27, 29, 33, 35, 48, 68–72, 75, 77, 78, 79, 82, 272, 273, 276; *see also* 'chronicles, eponym'
- astronomical/celestial, meteorological, and terrestrial phenomena and natural disasters

- included in, 47–8, 77, 78, 208, 215, 216, 219, 235, 260, 272
- Babylonian, 5 n9, 7, 8, 17, 33, 34, 35, 67, 69 n21, 71, 72–80, 82, 102 n12, 104 n20, 273, 275, 297–300, 362, 363
- Byzantine, 5 n9, 14 n25, 19 n36, 21, 30, 84 n70, 189, 203, 221–36, 238, 261, 285–6; *see also* ‘*Chronicon Paschale*’, ‘Theophanes’, and ‘*Kleinchroniken*’
- Carolingian, 40, 202, 203, 236, 237–49, 251, 252, 253–5, 256, 257–8, 259, 261, 263
- cartulary, 267
- Chinese, *see* ‘*Zhushu jinian*’
- Christian, 4, 6, 7 n12, 13, 25, 28, 35, 48, 119–31, 189–268, 337
- city
- late antique (non-existence of), 223 n83, 226 n91
  - late Byzantine, 235
- consularia, *see* ‘consularia’
- definition of, 20–58, 59–60; *see also* ‘annalistic structure’, ‘brevity’, ‘chronographic framework’, ‘parataxis’, and “‘uno in conspectu’” under ‘Tullius Cicero, M.’
- easy to compose, 128–9
- Egyptian, 7, 27, 33, 63–7, 79
- Palermo Stone/Royal Annals, 64–5, 66, 67, 84, 276
- epigraphic, 21, 23, 28 n45, 36, 37, 45, 52, 84–6, 95, 97, 150 n53, 160–6, 168–9, 170, 171, 173–5, 176, 177; *see also* ‘*Chronicon Romanum*’, ‘*Fasti Amiternini*’, ‘*Fasti Capitolini*’, ‘*Fasti Cuprenses*’, ‘*Fasti Gabini*’, ‘*Fasti Ostienses*’, ‘*Fasti Tauromenitani*’, ‘*Fasti Venusini*’, ‘*Parian Marble*’
- eponym, 20, 68–72, 77, 78, 272; *see also* ‘eponym/*limmu* lists’ and ‘eponyms/*limmu*’
- family, 60
- Franciscan, 60
- Greek
- early possible, 82–3; *see also* ‘Demetrius of Phaleron’, ‘Hellanicus’
  - Hellenistic, 5 n9, 7, 27, 35, 37, 83, 84–9, 95, 96, 98, 106 n24, 108, 279–80, 336–7, 340, 342
  - characteristics of, 33, 83, 87 n81, 95–6, 121–2, 279, 336, 349
  - and Eusebius, 98, 121–3, 124, 338–9
  - see also* ‘Olympiad’, below, and ‘Apollodorus’, ‘Castor of Rhodes’, ‘Eratosthenes’, ‘Eusebius’, ‘*Parian Marble*’
  - imperial, 89–91; *see also* ‘late antique’ and ‘Oxyrhynchus’ below, and ‘Cassius Longinus’, ‘Phlegon of Tralles’
  - interpretation of, as Christian works, 33–5, 49, 274, 336–7
  - Irish, 4 n6, 5, 184, 192, 207, 208–21, 236, 237, 276 n1, 376–7
  - Clonmacnoise tradition of, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 220
  - Israelite, 78–9
  - late antique/late Roman, 2, 4, 5 n9, 7, 8, 18–19, 24–5, 35, 37, 40, 42, 44 n70, 49, 80, 98, 119–31, 175–87, 190, 191, 193, 202, 219, 220–1, 228, 232 n113, 234, 237, 240, 254, 260, 261, 263–4, 265, 267, 270, 274, 277 n3, 320–35; *see also* ‘Cassiodorus’, ‘consularia’, ‘Eusebius’, ‘*Gallie Chronicle of 452*’, ‘*Gallie Chronicle of 511*’, ‘Hydatius’, ‘Jerome’, ‘John of Biclar’, ‘Marius’, ‘Prosper’, ‘Victor’
  - medieval
    - in Austria, 260 n202
    - in Bohemia, 260–1
    - in Britain, 1, 56, 184, 204–20, 221; *see also* ‘Bede’
    - in Iberian peninsula, 192–203, 250–3; *see also* ‘Isidore’
    - in Scandinavia, 260–1  - not a Christian invention, 79–80, 273–4
  - Olympiad, 7, 8, 17–18 n34, 86–7, 88, 89–90, 95, 98, 101 n9, 112, 114, 121, 122–3, 278, 313–16, 346–9, 352–3, 363, 365; *see also* ‘Olympiads’ under ‘chronological systems’ and ‘Olympic victors and victor lists’
  - origin of the word, 89, 278–87
  - Oxyrhynchus, I 12: 20, 90, 121, 313–15
  - Oxyrhynchus, XVII 2082: 90, 313
  - paschal (Easter-table chronicles), 1–4, 5 n9, 19 n37, 23 n40, 24, 25, 28 n45, 54, 55–7, 59,

- 60, 129, 177, 183–4, 244, 247–9, 259  
n199, 272, 273, 277, 324–7  
as origin of Irish chronicles, 212 n69,  
215–17, 218  
Phoenician, 78–9, 101, 105; *see also* ‘Menander of Ephesus/Pergamon’  
post-Carolingian, 255–67  
Roman, 91–8, 318–20; *see also* ‘epigraphic’  
above, and ‘Chronicon Romanum’, ‘Cornelius Nepos’, ‘Pomponius Atticus, T.’  
Syriac, 5 n9, 19 n36, 21, 30, 84 n70, 125, 227,  
229 n101, 276 n1, 375–7  
town, 60  
universal  
    Byzantine, 232  
    definition of 59–60  
    Hellenistic, 101, 106, 190 n3  
    medieval, 2, 26, 60, 190 n3, 237, 254–5,  
    257–8, 261–3, 266, 267, 268 n230  
    Roman, 31, 91, 213 n72  
‘world’  
    Byzantine, 189, 224, 232 n113, 233, 234,  
    236, 261; *see also* ‘breviaria, Byzantine’,  
    ‘epitome histories, Byzantine’, ‘history,  
    universal’  
    Christian, 336, 337, 342  
    Irish, 213  
    medieval, 262, 268  
*Chronicon Brixiense*, 253 n180  
*Chronicon Bruxellense*, as Byzantine *breviari-  
um*/epitome, not chronicle, 32, 62, 233  
*Chronicon Dertutense*, 252–3  
Χρονικὸν ἐπίτομον, 32, 62, 233 n117  
*Chronicon Edessenum*, Syriac chronicle, 375  
*Chronicon Fontanellense*, *see* ‘*Annales Fontanellenses*’  
*Chronicon Laurissense breue*, 239 n140, 246–7  
*Chronicon Moissiacense*, 248, 249 n169, 254, 263  
*Chronicon Montis Sereni*, 262  
*Chronicon Namnetense*, 258  
*Chronicon Nemausense*, 248, 249 n169  
*Chronicon Paschale*, early Byzantine chronicle/  
chronograph, 21, 31, 47, 118 n74, 191, 203,  
223 n80, 224–7, 228, 229, 233, 262, 276,  
323–4, 350, 361  
and consularia, 55, 179–80, 181–2, 186,  
224–5, 226, 276  
and Marcellinus *comes*, 55, 179–80, 181–2,  
186, 226  
Chronicon Romanum, epigraphic Greek chron-  
icle, 20, 24, 84 n70, 95, 98, 121, 124, 159, 170,  
309–10, 341  
*Chronicon S. Dionisii*, 248 n168  
Chronicon Scotorum, 211, 212, 213, 214  
*Chronicon uniuersale*, 237, 253–4, 262 n207,  
263 n214, 289  
*Chronicon Vedastinum*, 254 n182  
*Chronicon Viennense*, 254 n185  
*Chronicon Wirzburgense*, 262  
chronograph  
    annotated, 61, 117,  
    defined, 29–30, 61, 89, 118, 232, 338  
*Chronograph of 354*, 5 n9, 51, 52 n82  
    bishop list of, 370  
    *Breuiarium Vindobonense* in, 97, 98 n112  
    calendar of, 138 n13, 148–9  
    fasti of  
        as basis for modern consular list, 136 n7, 160  
        as proto-consularia, 23, 49 n78, 176–7  
        and dictator years, 136 n7  
Χρονογραφεῖον σύντομον, 61, 338, 368  
*Chronographia Golenischevensis*, 50, 51 n81, 55,  
117 n74  
*Chronographia Scaligeriana*, 50, 51 n81, 55, 61,  
117 n74, 118  
chronographic framework, as a characteristic of  
a chronicle, 23–4, 29 n49, 66, 190, 224, 226,  
228, 231, 234, 242, 249, 256, 257, 261, 263,  
266, 271, 377  
chronographic writing, criticisms of, 44–5, 269  
n1, 284–5, 293–5, 357–8  
chronography, apologetic, *see* ‘apologetic chron-  
ography’  
chronological systems  
    *ab urbe condita* (AUC), 94, 118, 136, 142 n24,  
    161, 162, 170, 189, 198, 261, 354–5, 371–3  
    *anni a passione* (from the Crucifixion), 36, 38  
    n62, 55, 56, 57, 130, 185  
    *anni ab incarnatione*, 2 n2, 36, 55, 115–16,  
    198, 218, 230

- anni Domini* (= *ab incarnatione*) 18 n34, 23 n40, 36, 70, 130, 207, 212, 218, 226, 253, 255, 261, 262, 266; *see also* 'Crucifixion'
- anni mundi* (from Creation), 28, 31, 34, 36, 37, 107, 115, 118, 124, 125 n94, 131, 185, 186, 200, 203, 205, 207, 207, 225–6, 229–30, 359; *see also* 'Creation'
- archons, 37, 68, 81, 83, 84, 85 n73, 88, 89–90 n87, 124, 125, 272, 284, 301, 304–10, 313–15, 341, 350, 352 n15, 353, 362, 379
- consular years, 38 n63, 352 n15, 354
- consuls and consular dating, 2 n2, 10–11, 23, 27, 36–7, 37–8, 41, 43, 50, 55–6, 57, 60, 68, 94, 97, 116 n66, 118, 130, 133–7, 142 n24, 143, 156–7, 159–68, 170, 171–2, 180, 181, 182, 183–4, 184–5, 185–6, 193, 225, 226, 266, 272, 276, 284, 286 n23, 293, 354–5, 375
- Easter cycles, 28 n45, 57, 130 n106, 205, 230 n105, 259 n199, 367–8, 369, 370
- epacts, 212, 218
- eponyms/*limmu*, 5 n9, 68–71, 362
- era
- Byzantine, 225
  - of Diocletian, 230 n105
  - provincial
    - in Viminacium, 373
    - Spanish, 37, 185, 195, 197–8, 202, 203, 253, 334
- indictions, 2 n2, 36, 38 n62, 130, 137, 185–6, 224, 225, 230–1, 235
- Jubilees, 37, 185
- Olympiads, 17 n34, 27, 36, 37, 86, 88, 90, 92 n95, 95, 119, 121, 124, 129, 130, 185, 212, 225, 226, 278, 283 n16, 284, 344 n2, 346, 347, 348, 349, 350, 351, 352–3, 363, 365, 372, 379
- first, 27, 78, 82, 86, 87, 89, 329, 338, 347, 352, 364, 365, 371, 372
  - synchronized with Syro-Macedonian year, 86 n77, 352 n15, 372
  - see also* 'chronicles, Olympiad'
- post-consulates, 38 n62, 135–6, 182
- regnal years, 2 n2, 23 n40, 37–8, 40, 57, 62, 64, 70, 73–4, 79, 121 n85, 124, 129–30, 133, 137, 164, 182, 185, 198, 200, 202, 212, 217–18, 220, 225, 226, 230, 242, 261, 262 n207, 266, 267, 345, 377
- Six Ages of the World, 199, 200, 205, 220, 251 n175, 254, 255, 268 n230
- Social War, inception point for epigraphic *fasti* and *consularia*, 28 n45, 159, 166
- tribunicia potestas*, of Augustus and Tiberius, as dating system, 137, 164–5
- weeks of years, Daniel's seventy, 117, 366
- year-names, 63, 65, 68 n16, 72, 73
- years of Abraham, 23 n40, 36, 37, 125, 128, 129–30, 185, 212, 225, 266 n224
- Cicero, *see* 'Tullius Cicero, M.'
- Cincius Alimentus, L., early Roman historian, 95, 375
- on date of foundation of Rome, 372
- Cinamus, John, Byzantine historian, 236 n131
- Claudius Ptolemaeus, *see* 'Ptolemy of Alexandria'
- Claudius Quadrigarius, C., early Roman historian, 93
- Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata*, 87 n79, 111, 112, 114, 115 n62, 116, 117 n70, 119, 120, 121 n85, 279 n2, 282 n10, 342 n9, 343, 344 nn1 and 2, 347, 366, 380
- Cleodemus Malchus, Samaritan (?) historian, 108
- Codinus, Ps-, *Patria Constantinopoleos*, 368
- Cohortatio ad Graecos*, anonymous Christian apologetic (Ps-Justin), 111, 112 n54, 113, 350
- comets, 47, 85
- Commemoratio abbatum Lemouicensium basilice S. Martialis Apostoli*, 258
- compendia
- Byzantine, 30, 89
  - chronographic, 1 n1, 29, 51
- Constantine Manasses, *Breuiarium*, 232 n113
- on history and chronography, 14 n25
- Constantine Porphyrogenitus, Byzantine emperor, *Excerpta* of, 234, 281 n8, 286 n20
- consular lists, *see* 'fasti'
- consularia, 5 n9, 57–8, 75 n36, 170–2, 173–84, 230, 232, 246, 249, 274, 317–27
- Alexandrian, 50, 54–5, 179, 181, 226 n93
  - and Assyrian eponym chronicles, 68, 69, 79

- and Babylonian chronicles, 73–4, 79  
 Carthaginian, 50–1, 177  
 Cassiodorus's chronicle as, 5 n9, 11, 36, 41–2, 42–3, 53, 58, 183, 186, 360  
 characteristics of, 11, 12, 16, 19 n37, 21, 24, 25, 35–57, 59, 60, 176–7, 180, 235, 272, 360–1  
 Constantinopolitan, 47, 49, 52 n84, 55, 177, 178, 179–80, 181–2, 186, 224–5, 226, 272, 276  
 contemporary names for, 11  
 early epigraphic, 28 n45, 36–7, 43–5, 49, 157, 159, 160, 165–6, 168–9, 170, 171, 173–4, 176, 317–18  
 and calendars, 137, 151–2, 155, 158, 170, 172  
 end of, 181–4, 191, 272  
 and fasti, 36–7, 39, 41, 157–71, 272  
 have no interest in ecclesiastical history, 48–9, 50  
 illustrated, 51, 53, 54 n87  
 in Spain, 177, 180, 181  
 in Trier, 175, 177, 181  
 increase of interest in at end of fourth century, 178  
 influence of on chronicles, 37–8, 39, 47, 54, 57–8, 130, 131, 183, 184–5, 186, 191  
 and paschal chronicles, 4, 23 n40, 25, 39, 55–7, 60, 183–4, 272, 324–7  
 proto-consularia, 49 n78, 165, 166, 168, 171, 173, 176, 177  
 references to Christian history, Christians, and martyrs, 39, 48, 49, 50–1, 52, 176–7, 272  
 sources of, 46–8, 151–3, 155, 170–1, 181–2  
 used by Andreas Agnellus, 54, 179, 263  
 used in the Middle Ages, 263–4  
*see also* the various '*Consularia*' entries below and '*Descriptio consulum*'  
*Consularia Berolinensia*, 51 n81, 54–5, 57, 175 n4, 176  
*Consularia Caesaraugustana*, 54, 180, 185, 196, 197  
*Consularia Golenischevensia*, 47, 50, 55, 179, 361  
*Consularia Hafniensia*, 21, 43, 53, 54, 58, 179, 182, 183, 202 n38, 264, 277 n3  
*Consularia Italica* tradition, 12 n21, 29, 38 n64, 39, 40 n66, 43, 47 n73, 53, 56, 178–80, 183, 186, 226 n93  
*Consularia Marsiburgensia*, 51 n81, 54, 57, 178, 264  
*Consularia Ravennatia*, 12 n21  
*Consularia Scaligeriana*, 49 n78, 50, 55, 116 n66, 176, 179, 276, 277 n3, 321  
*Consularia Vindobonensia*, 12 n21, 21, 38 n64, 41, 43, 49 n78, 50, 54, 55, 56 n91, 57, 95, 116 n66, 175–6, 179, 276, 321–3, 361  
*posteriora*, 54, 115, 179, 182  
*priora*, 47, 54, 182, 321, 361  
*consules ordinarii* (ordinary consuls), 133, 135, 168  
*consules suffecti* (suffect consuls), 135, 142 n25, 159, 168, 174  
 consuls, as dating system, *see* 'chronological systems'  
 consulship, abolition of non-imperial, in 541, 38 n62, 55–6, 130, 136, 182, 183, 191  
*consummatio mundi*, 34, 114–16  
*see also* 'Christ, return of'  
*Continuatio Havniensis Prosperi*, *see* '*Consularia Hafniensia*'  
 Cornelius Nepos  
 Ausonius sends copy of to Probus, 128, 178  
*Chronica*, 37, 91–5, 96, 97, 127, 142 n24, 155, 170  
 on date of foundation of Rome, 372  
 title of, 281 n10, 282  
*Vita T. Pomponii Attici*, 161 n75  
 Cosmas of Prague, *Chronica Boemorum*, 260–1  
 Creation, as starting point for chronicles and histories, 28, 31, 40, 41, 58, 75, 76, 104, 107, 110, 117, 124, 125 n94, 127, 128, 130, 185, 186, 189, 199–200, 213, 216, 223, 224, 232 n113, 254, 255, 257, 262 n207, 271, 359  
*see also* '*anni mundi*' under 'chronological systems'  
 Croke, Brian, 5 n9, 36 n57, 42 n67, 45 n71, 360–1, 365  
*Crónica de Sebastián*, 251–2  
*Crónica profética*, 251 n176



- Crucifixion  
 as chronological linchpin, 31, 57, 60, 185  
 date of, in Eusebius, 381
- Ctesias, 100, 344 n2
- Ctesicles, Greek chronicler, 86, 280 n3, 363–4  
*see also* 'Stesiclides of Athens'
- Dares Phrygius, 238, 378
- Date List A, Babylonian, 73
- date lists, 63–4, 72–3, 75, 78
- Degrassi, Attilio, 158–9, 161, 162
- Demetrius, Jewish historian, 106, 109, 110, 112
- Demetrius of Alexandria, Easter cycle of, 368
- Demetrius of Phaleron, Ἀρχόντων ἀναγραφὴ,  
 early Greek chronicler, 83, 84, 85, 86, 88, 283  
 n14, 342 n9
- Descriptio consulum*, fasti and consularia, 45, 47,  
 53, 54, 57, 171, 174 n3, 175–8, 180, 264,  
 318–21, 361
- and Achantia, widow of Maternus Cynegius,  
 177, 178
- authorial intrusions in, 52
- blank years in, 40, 175–6
- Christian content of, 49, 50–1, 116 n66,  
 176–7
- Constantinopolitan continuation of, 55, 177,  
 178, 179–80, 181, 186
- dates of composition, 29, 175, 177–8, 182, 184
- evidence for early Latin chronicle in, 95–6,  
 318–20
- fasti of, 39, 161
- Greek translation of, 54, 55, 177, 179, 181,  
 225, 226
- and Jerome, 178, 184
- Deucalion, flood of, 85, 336–7  
 dated, 336
- Dexippus, Χρονικὴ ἱστορία, imperial Greek  
 historian, 29, 270, 280 n3
- attacked by Eunapius, 178, 284–5, 358
- not a chronicler, 18 n34, 88 n84, 284–5, 358
- Dexter, chronicler (?), 379–80
- Diamerismos*, added to Συναγωγὴ χρόνων, 371
- dictator years, *see* 'Terentius Varro, M.'
- Diodorus of Tarsus, modifier of Eusebian chro-  
 nology, 125
- Diodorus Siculus, *Bibliotheca*, 28, 189 n1, 232  
 n113, 280–1, 285, 352
- as chronicler, 18 n34, 88 n84, 285
- on date of foundation of Rome, 372
- source for later apologists and chroniclers, 112,  
 113, 343, 344 n2, 353
- Diogenes Laërtius, imperial Greek philosopher,  
 on Stesiclides/Ctesicles, 342 n9, 363
- Diogenianus, probable Greek chronicler, 282
- Dionysius Exiguus, Easter tables of  
 and 532-year cycle, 205
- and *anni Domini*, 130, 218, 226
- and paschal chronicles, 1, 56
- Dionysius of Halicarnassus  
*Antiquitates Romanae*, 28
- and *Atthides*, 81, 82 n59
- as chronicle, 18 n34, 88 n84, 285
- Χρόνοι, 280
- disparages chronographic writing, 269 n1, 357
- on date of foundation of Rome, 371, 372
- on development of Greek historiography, 294  
 n9
- Dionysius of Syracuse, visited by Roman delega-  
 tion before his birth, 92
- Dionysius, Ps-, of Tel-Mahre, Syriac chronicler,  
*see* 'Chronicle of Zuqnin'
- Dionysius, Ps-, the Areopagite, letter of, 351,  
 381–2
- Dius, Phoenician historian, 79, 105
- used by Eusebius, 344 n2
- used by Josephus, 108
- Douris of Samos, Greek historian, 101 n9
- Dumville, David, 5 n9, 13 n23, 190 n2
- earthquakes  
 as feature of chronicles, 47, 85, 121, 309, 316,  
 320, 321, 328, 332
- at time of Crucifixion, 350, 381
- Easter, date of, 3, 130 n106, 205, 367, 368, 380
- Easter cycles  
 112-year (= seven sixteen-years cycles), 367,  
 369–70
- 532-year, 130 n106, 205, 259 n199
- Alexandrian, 230 n105
- eight-year, of Demetrius of Alexandria, 368

- eighty-four, 215–17  
 in *Paschale Campanum*, 28 n45  
 sixteen-year, 367–8, 369, 370  
 see also under 'chronological systems'
- Easter tables, 212, 218  
 as the origin of 'annals', 1–5, 13, 19 n37, 213, 247  
 see also 'chronicles, paschal', 'Dionysius Exiguus', 'Easter cycles', 'Victorius'
- Easter-table chronicles, see 'chronicles, paschal', 'Easter tables'
- ecclesiastical history, 48–9, 51, 52 n84, 60, 85, 98, 180, 183, 201, 204, 231 n111, 272
- Eclectic Chronicle, Babylonian, 71, 76
- eclipses  
 at time of Crucifixion, 350–2, 380, 381–2  
 recorded in chronicles, 51, 69, 85, 142 n24, 175, 215, 217, 308, 327
- Egyptian Royal Annals, see 'chronicles, Egyptian'
- Einhard  
 as author of *Annales Fuldenses*, 245  
 used by Ekkehard of Aura, 262  
*Vita Karoli*, 13 n24, 239, 289
- Ekkehard of Aura, chronicler, 261–2, 289  
 nature of work, 60  
 sources of, 264
- Elias Bar Shinaya, Syriac chronicler, 376
- Enlil-narari chronicle, Assyrian, 71
- Ennius, Q., *Annales*  
 and the fasti of Fulvius Nobilior, 141–4, 148, 156, 157, 374  
 on date of foundation of Rome, 371  
 on the title *Annales*, 294 n8, 375
- epacts, 368  
 see also 'chronological systems'
- Ephorus, Greek historian, 100–1, 363
- Ephraim, Byzantine chronicler, 232 n113
- Epiphanius of Constantia, *De mensuris et ponderibus*, 279
- Epiphanius Scholasticus, 238
- Epistle of Barnabas*, 114
- Epitoma/epitome chroniconum*, description of  
 Prosper's epitome of Jerome, 32, 286 n23
- epitome  
 in *Gallie Chronicle of 511*, 37 n61, 41, 185  
 in medieval texts, 241, 262 n207, 377, 378  
 in *POxy* IV.668, as early chronicle, 97, 98  
 of *Anales Castellanos Primeros*, 252  
 of Apollodorus, 88  
 of Carolingian chronicles, 257, 259 n199  
 of Eusebius, Syriac, 125, 376  
 of Gregory of Tours, in Fredegar, 242 n150, 377, 378  
 of Hydatius, in Fredegar, 241, 377, 378  
 of Irish chronicles, 211, 214  
 of Isidore, 251 n175  
 of Jerome, Prosper's, 31, 32, 38 nn62 and 63, 40, 41, 57, 60, 185, 193, 286–7 n23  
 of Livy (*periocliae*), 23, 27 n44, 31, 41, 42, 61, 77, 96–7, 162 n77, 186  
 of Pompeius Trogus, Justin's, 77, 238  
 of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, 208 n52
- Epitome de caesaribus*, Roman *breviarium*, 23, 31, 61, 233 n117  
 on date of foundation of Rome, 371
- epitome histories  
 Byzantine, 30–1, 32, 61, 126 n98, 223, 224, 226, 228, 230, 232, 233, 236, 285  
 compact (or 'chronicalized'), 32, 62  
 Carolingian, 252, 256, 258, 262  
 classical and late antique, 14 n25, 23, 31, 61, 96–7, 97–8, 195, 197, 198, 233 n117, 238  
 Fredegar, 238, 239 n140, 240–1, 242–3  
 Isidore, 194, 195, 197, 198  
*Liber historiae Francorum* and *Historia uel gesta Francorum*, 242–3  
 Nennius, 204 n40  
 Thallus, 365
- epitomes and *breviaria*, distinction between, 31, 32, 61, 233
- eponym chronicles, see 'chronicles, eponym'
- eponym/*limmu* lists, Assyrian, 5 n9, 68, 78, 362
- eponyms/*limmu*, Assyrian, 68–71, 362
- era, see 'chronological systems'
- Eratosthenes, Hellenistic chronicler  
 'Ολυμπιονίκαι, 82 n61, 87  
 Περὶ χρονογραφῶν, 7 n12, 86–7, 88, 278, 363  
 date of Fall of Troy in, 86–7, 364, 371–2, 374

- length of history, 284  
 and Olympiads, 86–7, 88, 352, 364  
 and pre-Olympic history, 86–7, 352  
 quoted by Clement and Eusebius, 87 n79  
 quoted by Clement and Tatian, 112  
 used by Apollodorus, 87  
 used by Castor, 88, 364
- Esarhaddon Chronicle, Babylonian, 76
- Eumenius, Latin panegyrist, on Fulvius' expenditures, 373–4
- Eunapius of Sardis, Greek historian, 29, 48, 270  
 on chronography, 178, 269 n1, 285, 286, 358, 379  
 on Dexippus, 178, 284–5, 358  
 on Longinus, 349
- Eupolemus, Jewish historian, 106–7, 108, 112, 115 n62  
 Ps-Eupolemus, 107  
 use of Hecataeus, 103 n16, 104
- Eusebius of Caesarea, 3, 4, 35, 40, 87 n81, 98, 109, 131, 184, 190 n2, 197, 207, 224, 230, 267  
 avoids standard eschatological chronology from Creation, 115 n64, 124–5, 131, 228–9  
 believes Abraham was first Christian, 110–11, 120, 124, 125, 128  
 Christianizes Greek Olympiad chronicle, 85, 121–3, 124, 338
- Chronici canones*, 2, 26, 31 n50, 48, 96, 98, 119–26, 127, 178, 184, 274, 281 n8, 286, 287, 291, 327–30, 337, 338  
 and Africanus, 344 n1; *see also* 'Julius Africanus'  
 and apologetic, 119–21, 122  
 as Hellenistic chronicle, 87 n81, 98, 121–3, 124  
 as pastiche of previous chronicles, 122  
 Armenian translation of, 125  
 and Cassius Longinus, 348–9  
 and Castor of Rhodes, 88 n84, 101 n9, 364–5  
 chronology of, revised by others, 125, 126  
 cited as definition of chronicle, 20, 359  
 columnar structure of, 49, 122–3, 124, 131, 200, 281 n8, 345  
 and Origen's *Hexapla*, 122  
 continuations of, 29, 98, 184, 376  
 and date of birth of Christ, 116 n66, 229 n102  
 and date of Cecrops, 101 n9  
 and date of eclipse at time of Crucifixion, 350, 351, 381–2  
 and date of fall of Troy, 87 n79  
 and date of flood of Deucalion, 85, 336–7  
 and date of foundation of Rome, 371  
 and date of Noah's flood, 337  
 and dates of Inachus and Aegialeus, 101 n9  
 and duration of Persian empire, 121 n85  
 and Eratosthenes, 87 n79  
*fila regnorum* of, 33, 49, 122–3, 124, 131, 265, 267, 338–9, 364  
 Greek text no longer extant, 125, 126  
 influenced by *Seder Olam*, 109–10  
 Jubilees in, *see* 'chronological systems'  
 Latin translation of, *see* 'Jerome'  
 and meteorite at Aegospotami, 85, 122  
 and Old Testament chronology, 110, 120–1 n83, 125  
 on date of foundation of Rome, 371  
 and Parian Marble, 85–6, 101 n9, 121, 122, 124, 336–7  
 and Porphyry, 120, 121 n83, 124, 343, 344 n2, 345–6, 349, 352, 353, 380  
 purpose for writing, 34, 120, 124  
 records even years with no historical events, 23 n40  
 regnal years in Latin chronicles copied from, 137  
 serves as model for later chroniclers, 191  
 sources for, 343–5, 380–1  
 surviving example of a Greek chronicle, 21  
 Syriac epitomes/translations of, 125, 227, 376  
 years from the birth of Abraham in, 125, 130, 229–30, 255, 266 n224; *see also* 'chronological systems'  
*see also* 'Jerome', *Chronici canones*
- Chronicle* (= *Chronographia* + *Chronici canones*), 7, 123, 125, 144 n32, 285, 339
- Chronographia*, 116, 123–4, 126, 228, 230, 278–9, 343

- and Africanus, 343, 344 n1, 345–8, 349; *see also* ‘Julius Africanus’
- Armenian translation of, 88 n84, 126, 275, 279, 340 n5, 343, 344 n1, 345, 348, 352 n15, 353
- as chronograph, 61, 89
- and Cassius Longinus, 343, 344 n2, 345–7, 348–9
- and Castor of Rhodes, 352 n15, 364
- imitated by Syncellus, 30, 227
- inspired by Africanus, 30
- list of Olympic victors in, 345–7, 349
- on Babylonian kings, 339–40
- on Egyptian pharaohs, 430–41
- source list in, 343–8, 350, 351–3, 380–1
- and Thallus, 343, 344 n2, 345–7, 349, 351–3, 365
- Armenian translation of, 88 n84, 126, 275, 279, 340 n5, 343, 344 n1, 345, 348, 352 n15, 353
- Commentary on Isaiah*, 285 n19
- doesn’t know Συναγωγή χρόνων, 119
- Eclogae prophetae*, 281 n8
- Historia ecclesiastica*, 48, 98, 279 n1
- and (Julius?) Cassian, 366
- and Hippolytus, 367, 368, 380
- and Judas, 366
- Latin translation of, *see* ‘Rufinus’
- used by Jerome, 380
- Praeparatio Euangelica*, 120, 122
- Syncellus critical of, 228–9
- Eusebius-Jerome, *see* ‘Jerome, *Chronici canones*’
- Eustathius of Epiphaneia, Byzantine historian, 126 n98
- Euthymenes, possible Greek chronicler, 282
- Eutropius, *Breviarium*
- as *breviarium*/epitome, 23, 31, 61, 195, 197, 198, 238, 274, 284
- in Bede, 206
- in Carolingian Francia, 238
- in Isidore, 199, 201
- on date of foundation of Rome, 371
- on length of Regal Period, 162 n77
- Eutychius, patriarch of Alexandria, *Annales* (*Nazm al-jawhar*, Arabic chronicle from Adam to 935), shares source with *Chron. Scal.*, 118 n74
- Evagrius Scholasticus, Greek ecclesiastical historian, 223
- Excerpta Latina barbari*, *see* ‘*Chronographia Scaligeriana*’
- Excerpta Sangallensia*, excerpts from original *Consularia Vindobonensia priora*, 47 n74, 54, 179, 182, 264, 276, 321
- Fabius Pictor, Q., early Roman historian, 95, 375
- on date of foundation of Rome, 354, 372
- Fannius, C., early Roman historian, 93
- fasti
- and acta triumphorum, 161, 162–3, 164 n83, 167, 170
- as proto-chronicle/consularia, 23, 33, 49, 55, 171, 176–7
- and Augustus, 151 n55, 160–5, 167, 170
- as pontifex maximus, 141 n20, 167
- and calendars, 137–8, 141, 142, 143, 144–5, 146, 155, 156, 158, 159, 166 n91, 167, 169–70, 172
- compiled for historical or antiquarian reasons, 11, 33, 36, 73, 136, 141–2, 144, 146, 156–7, 158, 159, 160, 161–5, 166, 170
- copied and extended, 33, 157
- corruption of, 53–4, 116 n65, 156, 157
- defined, 9, 10–11, 12, 272–3
- early compilations of, 155–6
- epigraphic/painted, 36, 138 n13, 141–5, 155–70, 171–2, 173–4
- begin with Augustus, 159, 167
- begin with Social War, 28 n45, 159, 166
- mainly found near Rome, 169
- not consulted by compilers of manuscript fasti, 174
- tradition lasts longer than that of epigraphic calendars, 169–70
- from Atticus’s *Liber annalis*, 161 n75, 170
- heart of consularia, 36–7, 39
- like Assyrian eponym/*limmu* lists, 68
- memorized, 134
- ‘municipal’ vs ‘private’, 158

- not officially compiled or published, 140, 146–50, 156–7, 158–9, 160–1, 162–3, 168–9, 171
- of Cassiodorus, 36, 41, 186
- of *Chronicon Paschale*, 226
- of *Chronograph of 354*, 23, 160, 176
- with Fasti Capitolini became modern standard list, 136 n7, 160
- of consularia, 50, 54, 57, 95–6, 171, 175 n4, 176–7, 202 n38
- of Consularia Italica, 39
- of *Descriptio consulum*, 39
- of Fulvius Nobilior, 141–2, 143, 144, 146, 155, 157, 159, 171–2, 374–5; *see also* ‘Fulvius Nobilior, M.’
- of Livy, 354, 355
- of Verrius Flaccus, 144–6, 156; *see also* ‘Verrius Flaccus, M.’
- see also* ‘Fasti’ entries below and ‘Tivoli fragments’; for calendars, *see* ‘calendar’; for triumphal lists, *see* ‘acta triumphorum’
- Fasti Amerini, epigraphic fasti, 141 n20
- Fasti Amiternini
- epigraphic calendar, 138 n13
- epigraphic fasti, 141 n20, 165–6
- as proto-consularia, 171
- begins with Social War, 166
- Fasti Antiates maiores
- painted fasti, 141 n20, 142 n25, 157, 159–60, 172
- as continuation of fasti of Fulvius Nobilior, 159, 374
- unofficial character of, 158 n69
- painted pre-Julian calendar, 138, 151 n55, 159
- Fasti Antiates ministorum, epigraphic calendar, 151 n56
- Fasti Aricini, epigraphic ‘fasti’ cited by Macrobius, 142 n26
- Fasti Caeretani, epigraphic calendar and fasti, 166 n91
- Fasti Caleni, epigraphic fasti, 169, 174
- Fasti Capitolini, epigraphic fasti, 141 nn20 and 21, 157, 160–5, 167 n92
- antiquarian not official origins, 136, 160–4, 170
- as proto-consularia, 23, 161, 166, 170, 171
- and Augustus’s years of tribunician power, 137, 164–5
- and date of foundation of Rome, 371
- and dictator years, 136 n7
- Fasti Colotiani, epigraphic fasti, 141 n20
- Fasti Cuprenses
- epigraphic calendar, 138 n13
- epigraphic fasti, 165
- as developed proto-consularia, 166, 171
- begin with Social War, 166
- Fasti fratrum Arvalium, epigraphic calendar, 151 n56
- Fasti Gabini, epigraphic fasti, 165
- Fasti Guidizzolenses, epigraphic calendar, 138 n13, 139 n14
- Fasti Interamnates, epigraphic calendar, 169
- Fasti Lanuvini, epigraphic fasti, 138
- Fasti Maffeiiani, epigraphic calendar, 151 n56
- Fasti magistrorum uici, epigraphic fasti, 141 n20, 167
- Fasti Nolani, epigraphic calendar, 138 n13
- Fasti of 161, hypothetical manuscript fasti, 157
- Fasti Oppiani, epigraphic calendar, 151 n56
- Fasti Ostiensis, 21, 28–9, 45, 165, 168–9, 171, 173, 276, 317–18
- inception date, 159
- not official record, 36, 158, 168–9, 171
- sources of, 150 n53, 168, 171
- Fasti Palatii Urbinatis, epigraphic calendar, 138 n13
- Fasti Palatini, epigraphic fasti, 169, 174
- Fasti Parisini, manuscript fasti, 56 n92, 183
- Fasti Pighiani, epigraphic calendar, 138
- Fasti Potentienses, epigraphic fasti, 169
- Fasti Praenestini, epigraphic calendar and fasti, 144–5, 151 n55, 156, 374–5
- cited by Macrobius, 142 n. 26, 157 n68
- see also* ‘Verrius Flaccus, M.’
- Fasti Sabini, epigraphic calendar, 151 n56
- Fasti Sorrinenses minores, epigraphic calendar, 138
- Fasti Tarentini, epigraphic calendar, 138 n13
- Fasti Tauromenitani
- epigraphic calendar, 138 n13

- epigraphic fasti, 165–6, 169  
 as proto-consularia, 166, 171
- Fasti Venusini  
 epigraphic calendar, 138 n13  
 epigraphic fasti, 165  
 as proto-consularia, 166, 171  
 begin with Social War, 166, 167
- Fasti Viae dei Serpenti, epigraphic calendar, 151 n56
- Feriale Duranum, third-century manuscript list of festivals, 139 n16
- ferialia*, festival lists, 46, 139–40, 142
- Festus, *Breviarium*, 31, 61  
 and length of Regal Period, 162 n77  
 in Isidore, 201
- Filocalus, and the *Chronograph of 354*, 149–50
- Flaccus, *see* 'Verrius Flaccus, M.'
- Flavius, Cn., and early Roman calendar, 139
- Flavius Josephus, *see* 'Josephus, Flavius'
- Florus, *Epitome*, 23, 31, 61, 274
- Fornara, Charles William, 357, 362
- Forum Augustum, 94 n102, 159, 163, 164 n83
- forum of Praeneste, location of Fasti Praenestini, 145, 156
- Forum of Trajan, Rome, 152
- Forum Romanum, 152, 159, 160, 162, 163
- Forum Transitorium, Rome, calendar and fasti on Arch of Janus in?, 138 n13
- Fragmentum Fuldense*, of Tertullian's *Apologeticum*, 113–14 n57
- Frankish Annals of Lindisfarne, *see* '*Annales Iuuauenses*'
- Frechulf of Lisieux, *Historiae*, 254  
 sources of, 263
- Fredegar, *Chronicae*, 240–3, 250, 377–8  
 and Gregory of Tours, 13, 238, 239 n140  
 not a chronicle, 240–1, 242, 262  
 used as a source, 254, 258, 265  
*see also* '*Historia uel Gesta Francorum*'
- Froissart, *Chroniques*, 12, 14, 59  
 Amiens manuscript of, 14 n26  
 not a chronicle, 12, 14, 224 n86
- Frutolf of Michelsberg, chronicle of, 60, 261–2
- Fulvius Nobilior, M., consul, censor, and early antiquarian, 140–1, 143, 145, 148, 156, 371, 373–4  
 calendar and fasti of, 140–4, 145, 146, 147, 155, 161, 170, 172, 374–5  
 continued by Fasti Antiates maiores, 159, 160, 172  
 fasti of, as source for later fasti, 156–7  
 on date of foundation of Rome, 371  
*see also* '*aedes Hercules Musarum*'
- Gallic Chronicle of 452*, 21, 25, 44, 53, 186, 277 n3  
 as continuation of Jerome 37, 57, 130, 185, 187  
 read and copied in early Middle Ages, 263, 264  
 witness to early tradition of Consularia Italica, 179
- Gallic Chronicle of 511*, 21, 25, 37, 197, 277 n3  
 an epitome, 37 n61, 41, 185  
 little known or read in early Middle Ages, 129 n104  
 sources of, 185  
 witness to early tradition of Consularia Italica, 179
- Gellius, Aulus, *Noctes Atticae*  
 knowledge about in Middle Ages, 295 nn10 and 12  
 and meaning of '*annales*', 18 n35, 59, 291–4, 295, 357, 359  
 quotes Cornelius Nepos, 282 n13  
 refers to and quotes Apollodorus and his *Chronica*, 89, 91 n93, 282 n10  
 uses word '*chronica*', 283, 286
- Gellius, Cn., early Roman historian, 92 n96  
 on date of foundation of Rome, 355, 371
- Gennadius of Marseilles, *De uiris illustribus*, 194, 287
- genre, 2–62, 66–7, 75 n36, 189–90, 262–3, 270–3, 292 n6, 360–1  
*see also* individual genres, viz. '*annals*', '*Atthis*', '*breviaria*', '*calendar*', '*chronicles*', '*chronograph*', '*consularia*', '*epitome*', '*fasti*', '*gesta*', '*hagiography*', '*history*', '*horoi*'

- Geoffrey of Monmouth, English historian, 204, 256
- George Acropolites, Byzantine historian, 236 n131
- George Pachymeres, Byzantine historian, 235 n130, 236 n131
- George Syncellus, *see* 'Syncellus, George'
- George the Monk, *Chronicon*, 7 n12, 231 n131, 233  
     on Eusebius, 119 n79  
     wrote *breuiarium*, not chronicle, 30, 32, 62, 126 n98, 254
- Gervase of Canterbury, *Chronica*, 19, 48  
     cited by modern scholars, 59, 292, 358–9  
     medieval knowledge of, 295–6  
     on the definition of 'chronicle' and 'annals', 18, 21, 22 n39, 26, 59, 292, 295–6, 358–9  
     on the definition of 'history', 22 n39, 292
- Gervase of Tilbury, *Otia Imperialia*, 263  
*gesta*, 1 n1, 289  
*Gesta abbatum Gemblacensium*, 265  
*Gesta comitum Barcinonensium*, 252  
*gesta episcoporum*, genre of, 239, 265
- Gildas, *De excidio Britanniae*, 204, 206
- Glycas, *see* 'Michael Glycas'
- 'Great Chronographer', Byzantine historian, 225 n88, 233, 234 n123
- Gregory of Tours, *Historiae*  
     as chronicle, 5 n9  
     as large-scale classicizing narrative history, 13, 191, 204, 236, 237, 238–9, 243  
     epitome of in Fredegar, 242 n150, 377, 378  
     uses feminine singular form, 'chronica', 287  
     uses the term 'consularia', 11, 12
- Gregory the Great, sixth-/seventh-century pope, 206, 254
- Hafniensis*, chronographic compilation of additions to and continuations of Prosper, 202 n38, 264  
     *see also* 'Consularia Hafniensia'
- Hagelochus, probable Greek chronicler, 280 n6
- Hagestratus, probable Greek chronicler, 280 n6
- hagiography, genre of, 1 n1, 201, 239, 256, 265
- hall of fame, in Forum Augustum, as three-dimensional chronicle, 94 n102, 163
- Hammurabi, Babylonian king, 72–3
- Hecataeus of Abdera, *On the Egyptians*, 87 n81, 103–4, 105, 112, 113
- Hegesippus, Latin translation of Josephus's *Jewish War*, 206
- Heliconius of Byzantium, Χρονική ἐπιτομή, 126 n98
- Hellanicus of Lesbos, early Greek historian, 87 n. 81, 344 n. 2  
     Ἀττική ξυγγραφή, 81, 82, 84  
     Ἱέρειαι τῆς Ἡρας αἱ ἐν Ἀργεῖ, 82–3
- Hellenistic Royal Chronicle, Babylonian, 76
- Hercules, temple of, *see* 'aedes Herculis Musarum'
- Herennius Philo of Byblos, Greek historian, 105
- Herimannus Augiensis, *see* 'Hermann of Reichenau'
- Hermann of Reichenau, Latin chronicler, 261, 263
- Herodotus, Greek historian, 6, 80 n53, 93 n98, 270, 344 n2, 362  
     and Egyptian antiquity, 63, 100  
     called a chronicler, 285
- Hieronymus, *see* 'Jerome'
- Hilarianus, *see* 'Julius Hilarianus'
- Hippias of Elis, Olympic victor list of, 82, 358, 364, 370
- Hippolytus, (1) author of a commentary on Daniel, and birth of Christ in AM 5500: 115, 121 n85, 369  
     (2) author of work on dating Easter, 367, 368, 380  
     (3) supposed anti-pope and martyr, 117, 366–7  
         as supposed author of a chronicle, 3, 98 n112, 116 n68, 119 n78, 190, 283, 368, 370–1  
         not the author of Συναγωγή χρόνων, 98 n112, 117, 368–9, 370–1  
         supposed statue of, 283, 367–68, 369–70
- Hippys of Rhegium, probable Greek chronicler, 279–80
- Hirtius, Aulus, continuator of Caesar's commentaries, 29 n48
- Historia Augusta*, late fourth-century Latin biographies, 150 n51, 238, 339 n3  
     use of consularia by, 173, 174

*Historia Miscella*, see 'Landolfus Sagax'

*Historia Silense*, medieval Spanish Latin history, 252

*Historia uel Gesta Francorum*, continuation of Fredegar, 241–3, 378

history

classicizing

Byzantine, 191, 225 n88, 230, 233

classical and late antique, 6, 45, 284

defined, 21–2, 270–1

medieval, 19, 204, 240, 243

Republican, 93–4

vs chronicles, 19, 20, 21, 25, 26–7, 27–8, 29, 45, 48, 53, 94, 244–5, 269, 286

universal

Byzantine, 189, 203, 224, 228, 232, 233, 236

Hellenistic, 18 n34, 86 n75, 100, 363

late antique, 18 n34, 119

medieval, 241, 242 n150, 243, 251, 254, 260, 263

Roman, 18 n34, 189 n1, 282 n11, 379

Hittites, 79

Homer, as imitator of Jewish/Egyptian wisdom, 103 n17, 105, 106, 112, 113, 348, 353, 380

*horoi/ὥροι*, 80–2, 362

Hugh of Flavigny, medieval historian, late Roman chronicle sources of, 263

Hugh of Fleury, author of epitome history and *Historia moderna*, 262

Hydatius, fifth-century chronicler, 3, 21, 29, 44, 185, 193, 246 n163, 264, 277 n3, 287, 334–5, 361

and early Consularia Italica tradition, 179

as continuator of Jerome, 37, 57, 130, 185, 187

chronologies used, 37, 130, 185

comments on own work and narrative, 17 n33, 24, 25, 28 n47, 34, 53

day dates used by, 39

used as source, 185, 197, 201, 240, 241, 263–4, 377, 378

Ildefonsus of Toledo, *De uiris illustribus*, 194

Incarnation, see 'Christ, birth of', 'chronological systems'

indications, see 'chronological systems'

intercalation, 139 n16,

Iona Chronicle, lost Irish chronicle, 213–14, 216, 217, 218, 219

Isidore, early medieval historian and encyclopedist, 192–201, 204

*Chronica*, 1 n1, 3, 7 n5, 31–2, 187, 194, 195, 198–201, 203, 206, 237, 243, 264

as chronicle epitome, 23, 30, 31–2, 41, 57, 60–1, 62, 98, 187, 191, 192–3, 210, 221, 225, 226, 233 n117, 241, 242, 253, 254, 261, 273

as epitome of Eusebius-Jerome, 198, 200, 201, 206

and chronicle genre, 23

chronology in, 130–1, 199–200, 206, 251 n175

hypothetical augmented edition of, used as a source for early version of Iona chronicle and by Bede, 215, 216, 217, 219, 221, 237 in MGH, 192

on origins of chronicles, 3 n3, 31 n50

and Prosper's epitome of Jerome, 31, 32, 57, 193

sources of, 198–9, 201

used as source, 58, 193, 197, 198, 206, 213, 220, 253, 263, 268 n230, 377

*De rerum naturae*, 194

*De uiris illustribus*, 194, 195, 196

and definition of 'chronicle', 19, 20, 31 n50

*Etymologiae*, 20, 31 n50, 193, 194

contains epitome of *Chronica*, 32, 187, 194, 199, 205, 359

and the meaning of *annales*, 288, 290–1, 295

and titles of Tacitus's histories, 18 n35, 292 n5

used as a source, 216

*Historia Gothorum*, 194, 195–8, 202–3, 251 n175

chronographic apparatus of, 198

in MGH, 195

parallels to in *Gallic Chronicle of 511*, 185

sources of, 197, 201

in Frankish Europe, 237, 243, 253–4, 263–4, 377

in Ireland, 210, 213, 215–17, 219–21



- in medieval Spain, 201–6, 251 n175  
and synonyms for ‘chronicle’, 20 n38, 359–60, 380
- Jacob of Edessa, Syriac chronicler, 21, 376  
and Eusebian chronology, 125
- Jacoby, Felix, 80 n53, 81 n55, 82 n61, 84, 283 n14, 284, 364, 365, 366, 379
- Jerome  
*Chronici canones*, 3, 4, 8, 21, 26, 31 n50, 44, 98, 120 n82, 126, 184, 202, 224, 225, 289, 330–2, 359  
anti-Arian narrative of, 24, 25, 48–9  
as ‘annals’, according to Isidore, 291  
as universal chronicle, 190  
augmented Eusebius to avoid gaps, 40  
brevity of, 26, 27, 31  
chronological systems, 31, 37, 38 nn62 and 63, 57, 128, 129–30, 137, 185, 199–200, 266 n224  
chronology of, 87 n79, 110, 162 n77, 205, 218, 255, 338, 380  
ends in 378: 38 n64, 39, 40 n66, 41, 56 n92, 126, 175, 176 n6, 179, 184, 265–6, 267  
Eusebius’s chronology of Crucifixion changed in, 381  
cited as definition of ‘chronicle’, 19, 20, 359, 360  
continued by later chronicles, 7 n12, 28 n47, 29, 37, 38 nn62 and 63, 40, 57, 130, 183, 184–7, 192, 193, 201, 202, 216  
*Descriptio consulum* as source for, 178, 184  
epitome of by Prosper, 31, 32, 38 nn62 and 63, 40, 41, 57, 60, 61, 185, 187, 193, 286 n23  
influence of, 126–7, 184, 187, 191, 202, 227, 244, 265, 286–7  
lack of ecumenical view of history in Latin before, 127  
modern editions of, 2  
not a major influence on consularia, 38  
on date of foundation of Rome, 371  
purpose of, 34  
and reintroduction of chronicle genre to the Latin West, 126–31, 286  
tradition of, in Middle Ages, 238, 244, 264–5, 266  
translates Eusebius, 96, 98, 119 n79, 120 n82, 125, 126, 178, 184, 274, 281 n8  
used as source, by late antique chroniclers, 31, 32, 40, 41, 42, 126, 127, 176, 185, 186, 187, 192, 197, 198, 200, 201, 206, 216, 217  
by medieval chroniclers and historians, 40, 126, 127, 240, 241, 253, 254, 261, 262 n207, 263, 268 n230, 377, 378  
*Commentarii in Daniele*, 206, 216, 287 n24, 380  
*De uiris illustribus*, 194, 201, 265, 366, 379–80  
and Hippolytus, 119, 367, 368, 380  
expressions used for ‘chronicles’, 20 n38, 286, 379–80  
*Sacra Biblia* (Vulgate), 110, 216, 288  
chronology of, 205, 206
- Joel, Byzantine historian, 232 n113
- John Cinnamus, Byzantine historian, 236 n131
- John Lydus, Byzantine antiquarian, 88 n84
- John of Antioch, Byzantine historian, wrote *breviarium* not chronicle, 30, 62, 285
- John of Biclar, Latin chronicler, 21, 187, 193  
and *Consularia Caesaris Augustana*, 54, 180, 196  
continued by *Chronicle of 741*, 202  
continues Jerome, Prosper, and Victor of Tunnuna, 29, 38 n62, 57, 187, 201, 202  
last late antique chronicle, 187, 191, 193  
source of *Chronicle of 754*, 203  
source of Isidore’s *Historia Gothorum*, 197, 199, 201
- John of Ephesus, Byzantine historian, and Malalas, 223 n80
- Jones, Charles W., 3–4, 55 n90, 56 n92, 190 n2
- Jordanes, early Byzantine historian, 243  
refers to consularia, 11  
used by Ekkehard of Aura, 262  
used by Sigebert of Gembloux, 265
- Josephus, identity of Roman ‘Hippolytus’, as hypothesized by Nautin, 366

- Josephus, Flavius, Jewish apologist and historian, 108–9, 283
- Eusebius and, 119, 343–4, 347, 380, 381
- Latin translation of (by Hegesippus), used as source, 206, 216, 238
- on apologetics, 102
- Seder Olam* and, 109
- used by Christian apologists, 112–13
- Jubilees, Jewish chronological system, *see* 'chronological systems'
- Judas, early Greek Christian chronographer, 111 n52, 366, 380
- Judicial Chronicle, Babylonian, 76
- Julian of Toledo, *Historia Wambae*, 201
- Julius Africanus
- as first chronicler, 3, 4, 13, 35, 190, 337, 370
  - Χρονογραφίαι, 7 n12, 30, 31 n50, 88, 102, 119, 278, 279 n1, 285, 286 n22, 338, 352 n15, 359, 366, 380
  - as apologetic chronography, 116–17, 120, 342
  - and the year AM 5500: 115–16, 117, 125, 229, 369
  - chronograph, not chronicle, 30, 61, 89, 109, 117, 229 n101, 278, 337
  - chronology of, 85, 121 n85, 336–7
  - and Eusebius, 30, 119, 120, 123, 125, 350, 380, 381
  - and Olympic victor list, 344 n2, 345–7, 349
  - lists of pharaohs in, 340–2
  - and Syncellus, 30, 227, 228, 229, 230
  - and Thallus, 350–1, 365, 381
  - used as source by Συναγωγή χρόνων, 50
  - used as source by Ps-Dionysius the Areopagite, 381
  - used as source by Ps-Eustathius, 115 n62
  - used as source by Ps-Justin, 117 n54
- Julius Caesar, C.
- anonymous continuation of, *Bellum Africum*, 29 n48
  - anonymous continuation of, *Bellum Hispaniense*, 29 n48
  - and calendar commemorations 149, 150–1, 153, 163
  - continuations of, by Aulus Hirtius, 29 n48
  - De bello Gallico* and *Bellum Civile*, 29 n48, 238
  - and new calendar, 140, 145, 154
- Julius Hilarianus, *De cursu temporum*, 378
- Justin, Roman epitomator, *see* 'Pompeius Trogus'
- Justin Martyr, Christian apologist, 111–12
- believed Abraham was a Christian, 110–11
  - Ps-Justin, *see* 'Cohortatio ad Graecos'
- Justus of Tiberias, Ἰουδαίων βασιλεῖς οἱ ἐν τοῖς στέμμασιν, 109, 112, 117 n70
- parallels with Leipzig Chronograph and other king lists, 109, 341
  - used by Eusebius, 119, 123
- Kaiserchroniken*, *see* 'Kleinchroniken'
- Kaisergeschichte*, lost fourth-century *breviarium*, 61
- on date of foundation of Rome, 371
- King List 6, Babylonian, 75 n37
- King List A, Babylonian, 75 n37
- King List B, Babylonian, 75 n37
- King List C, Babylonian, 73 n30
- King List Fragment, Babylon I, Babylonian, 75 n37
- King List, Larsa, Babylonian, 73 n30
- King List, Ur-Isin, Babylonian, 73 n30
- King List, Uruk, Babylonian, 75 n37
- king lists/regnal lists
- Assyrian, 66, 68, 71, 364
  - Babylonian, 73, 75, 76, 78, 79 n48, 339–40, 362
  - basis of Byzantine compact epitomes, 32, 62
  - Christian, 122
  - Christian apologists and, 112–13, 342
  - chronographs include collections of, 29–30, 61, 113, 123–4, 232, 279 n1, 285, 337–8
  - Egyptian, 64, 65, 340–1
  - Greek
    - Hellenistic, 122, 364
    - Imperial, 88 n85, 89, 122, 124, 341–2
    - Leipzig Chronograph and, 89 n86, 109, 117 n70, 118, 122, 336 n1, 337–41
    - Jewish, 109, 117 n70, 341  - laterculi*
  - Mozarabic, 252 n176

- Roman, 29  
 Visigothic, 251  
*see also* 'Laterculus'  
 Sumerian, 67  
*Kleinchroniken*, Byzantine, 191, 232–6
- Lampert of Hersfeld, Latin chronicler, 261  
 Landolfus Sagax, *Historia Miscella*, 262  
 Late Babylonian Chronicle series, 76  
*laterculi*, *see* 'king lists'  
*Laterculus* of Polemius Silvius, *see* 'Polemius Silvius'  
*Laterculus Malalianus*, medieval Latin epitome of Malalas, 224 n87  
*Laud Chronicle*, *see* 'Peterborough Chronicle'  
 Leipzig Chronograph, 61, 86, 109, 112, 117 n70, 118, 310–12, 336–42  
   not a chronicle, 89 n86, 116 n68, 337–8  
   not Christian, 336–7  
   regnal lists of, *see* 'king lists'  
 Lennon, John, 64  
 Leo Diaconus, Byzantine historian, 234 n121  
*Liber annalis*, *see* 'Pomponius Atticus, T.'  
*Liber Chalipharithum*, *see* 'Chronicle to the Year 724'  
*Liber generationis*, *see* 'Συναγωγὴ χρόνων'  
*Liber historiae Francorum*, 242–3, 254, 378  
*Liber pontificalis*, model for medieval genre, 239, 265  
   used as source, 58, 206, 216, 219, 255  
*Liber pontificalis ecclesiae Rauennatis*, *see* 'Agnellus, Andreas'  
 Liberian Catalogue, and Hippolytus, 370  
*libri memoriales*, medieval genre of, 239  
*libri uitae*, medieval genre of, 239  
 Licinius Macer, C., Roman historian, 92, 93  
*limmu* and *limmu* lists, *see* 'eponym/*limmu* lists' and 'eponyms/*limmu*'  
 Lindian Chronicle, Rhodian inscription containing inventories, 88 n84, 159, 280  
 Liutprand of Cremona, medieval historian, 262  
 Livy (T. Livius), *Ab urbe condita*, 6, 26, 27, 92 n95, 93, 170, 270, 274, 373–4  
   as annals, 291, 294 n8  
   as chronicle, 16, 189 n1  
   as history, 270–1  
   chronology of, 162 n77, 354–5  
   epitomes of, *see* 'epitome of Livy'  
   fasti and, 156, 157 n68, 161 n75  
   in the Carolingian Renaissance, 238  
   on date of foundation of Rome, 354–5, 372  
   parochial outlook of, 127 n102  
   size of, 16 n31, 18 n35, 26–7, 28, 94  
 Longinus, *see* 'Cassius Longinus'  
 Lorsch, Carolingian scriptorium of, 244, 246–7  
 Lucentius, apparent plagiarizer of Prosper's chronicle, 286 n23  
 Lucerius, and the 'Fredegar' tradition, 377  
 lustrum, Roman religious ceremony, as recorded in epigraphic fasti, 141, 159, 161 n76, 166, 171  
 Lutatius Catulus, Q. (cos. 102), early Roman historian, on date of foundation of Rome, 372
- Macedonian renaissance, 222, 234, 236  
 Malalas, sixth-century Byzantine historian, 223–4  
   *breviarium* of, not a chronicle, 30, 62, 126 n98, 222 n78, 223–4, 225, 228, 285  
   chronology of, 116 n66, 229  
   epitome of (*Laterculus Malalianus*), 224 n87  
   used as source, 226, 230  
 Manetho, Greek historian, 103–5  
   and Christian apologists, 112, 113  
   and Egyptian chronology, 340–1, 347, 380  
   and Eusebius, 343, 347, 380  
   Josephus and, 108  
 manuscripts  
   Amiens, Bibliothèque municipale, 486: 14 n26  
   Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Philipps 1829: 117  
   Bern, Burgerbibliothek, 306: 257 n191  
   Brussels, Koninklijke Bibliotheek van België 5301/20: 211  
   Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 173: 207  
   Dublin, Trinity College, 1282 (*olim* H. 1. 8), 210, 211  
   Elassona, Monastery of Panagia Olympiotissa 189: 235 n130  
   Gotha, Forschungsbibliothek, Memb. I 75: 56 n92  
   London, British Library, Cotton Domitian A VIII, 208 n52

- London, British Library, Cotton Titus A XXV, 211
- Oxford, Bodleian Library  
 Baroccianus graecus 182: 223  
 Bodley 309: 56 n92  
 Laud 636: 207  
 Rawlinson B. 488: 211  
 Rawlinson B. 502: 211  
 Rawlinson B. 503: 210
- Madrid, Biblioteca de la Universidad Complutense, 134: 196 n16
- Madrid, Biblioteca nacional, 8696: 195 n14
- Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm. 246: 237 n135
- Paris, Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal, Nouv. acq. lat. 2055: 268 n230
- Paris, Bibliothèque nationale  
 lat. 4859: 56 n92  
 lat. 4873: 195 n14  
 lat. 4884: 50  
 lat. 5132: 252 n178  
 lat. 5543: 257 n191  
 lat. 6815: 195 n14  
 lat. 10910: 117, 377  
 lat. 11019: 258 n197
- Rome, Biblioteca nazionale centrale Vittorio Emanuele II, Vitt. Em. 1325: 118 n75
- St Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek, 133: 118 n75
- St Omer, Bibliothèque municipale, 697: 238 n140
- St Omer, Bibliothèque municipale, 706: 238 n140, 240 n145
- Vatican City, Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana  
 gr. 1941: 225, 233 n118  
 gr. 2210: 232 n114  
 Reg. lat. 213: 241  
 Reg. lat. 984: 258 n197
- Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek  
 515: 246 n163  
 3416: 118  
 Hist. gr. 99: 233 n117
- Yerevan (Armenia), Matenadaran, 1904: 126 n96
- Yerevan (Armenia), Matenadaran, 2679: 126 n96
- Marcellinus *comes*, Latin chronicler, 21, 184, 185–6, 187, 238 n140, 277 n3, 360, 361  
 consularia and, 37–8 n62, 42, 47 n73, 54, 55, 57, 130, 179, 180 n15, 181, 182, 183, 186  
 consuls and indictions used by, 37, 130, 183, 185–6  
 continued, 29, 186  
 manuscript tradition of, 264  
 sources of, 45 n71, 47, 226  
 style of, 25, 39, 53, 57  
 used as source, 206, 216, 217, 219, 221, 263
- Margan Annals*, English, 257 n190
- Marianus Scottus, medieval chronicler, 262, 263, 265
- Marius of Avenches, Latin chronicler, 21, 185, 186, 187, 246  
 consularia and, 38 n62, 42, 54, 57, 58 n95, 182, 183  
 manuscript tradition of, 264  
 post-consulates in, 182  
 style of, 25  
 used as source, 263–4
- Marmor Parium, *see* 'Parian Marble'
- Maronite Chronicle*, Syriac, 376
- Maximus, unknown historian/chronographer named by Syncellus, 369
- Maximus of Zaragoza, *historiola*, 196–7  
 and *Consularia Caesaraugustana*, 180 n18, 196
- McCarthy, Daniel, 209 n53, 213 n72
- McCormick, Michael, 4
- McGuire, M. R. P., 5 n9, 190 n2
- Melkite Chronicle*, Syriac, 376
- Menander of Ephesus/Pergamon, Greek chronicler, 79, 105, 282, 342 n9  
 and Christian apologetics, 112, 113  
 and Josephus, 108
- Menander Protector, Greek historian, 285, 286 n20  
 meteorite, 85  
 in Aegospotami, 85, 122
- Michael Attaleiates, Byzantine historian, 234 n121
- Michael Glycas, *Annales*, 232 n113  
*breviarium*, not chronicle, 30, 62  
 on the chronicle genre, 14 n25

- Michael Panaretos, Byzantine chronicler, 236 n133
- Michael Psellus, Byzantine historian, 234 n121, 236
- Michael the Syrian, Syriac chronicler, 223 n80, 376
- Mommsen, Theodor, 2, 40, 56 n92, 192, 196, 204, 286–7 n23
- Mosshammer, Alden A., 344–6, 368
- Muirchú, Irish hagiographer, 219
- Nautin, Pierre, 366
- Near Eastern influences on early Greek historiography, 7, 63, 67, 79–80, 85, 268, 361–3
- Nennius, British historian, 204 n40
- Neo-Babylonian Chronicle series, 75–6, 78 n45, 297–9
- Neo-Babylonian Religious Chronicle, 77
- Nepos, *see* ‘Cornelius Nepos’
- Nicasylus, probable Greek chronicler, 280 n6
- Nicephorus, Byzantine historian, 7 n12, 233  
Χρονογραφικὸν σύντομον, 32, 62, 232  
Ἱστορία σύντομος (*Breuiarium*), 203, 226 n93, 232–3, 234, 235
- Nicephorus Gregoras, Byzantine historian, 236 n131
- Nicetas Choniates, Byzantine historian, 236 n131
- Notitia dignitatum*, illustrated list of late Roman military and civil offices, 51
- Numa Pompilius, legendary king of Rome  
and Fulvius’s temple, 141, 143  
and Pythagoras, 92–3, 143 n28, 358
- Numenius of Apamea, Greek philosopher, 110
- ‘Office of Public Information’ and distribution of imperial news, 151–4, 170–1
- Old Testament, 29, 49 n77, 110, 122, 220, 382  
chronicle sources for, 3  
chronology of, 106, 109–10, 114, 118, 125, 206, 336, 342, 369–70
- ‘Hippolytus’ and, 369–71  
in Eusebius-Jerome, 85, 110, 343–4
- Septuagint, 106, 110, 125 n94, 205, 206
- Vulgate, 110, 205, 206, 216, 288
- Olympiads, *see* ‘chronological systems’
- Olympiad chronicles, *see* ‘chronicles, Olympiad’
- Olympic Games, 121, 130, 352 n15
- Olympic victors and victor lists, 17 n34, 82, 87, 89, 143 n29, 278, 283, 315, 342 n9, 344 n2, 345–9, 352 n15, 358, 363, 379
- Ordo Gothorum Obetensium regum*, Visigothic *laterculus*, 251 n175
- origines gentium*, a non-existent genre, 243
- Orosius, *Historiae contra paganos*  
and Bede, 206  
described as ‘annals’, 288  
described as ‘chronicle’, 5 n9  
and Ekkehard of Aura, 262  
in Carolingian Renaissance, 238  
and Irish chronicles, 213, 215, 216, 220  
and Isidore, 197  
and Marcellinus *comes*, 57, 186  
Old English version of, 207
- Otto of Freising, *Chronica (Historia de duabus ciuitatibus)*, 191, 263
- Ovid, *Fasti*, 10, 12, 154–5, 170, 272  
and Augustan *feriae publicae*, 150 n50  
exegesis of, 149 n49
- Oxyrhynchus papyri  
I 12 (chronicle), 20, 90, 121, 313–15  
IV 668 (epitome of Livy), 97, 98  
XVII 2082 (chronicle), 90, 313  
Oxyrhynchus historian, 29
- Pacatianus, Roman usurper, coins of and AUC 1001: 372–3
- Pachymeres, *see* ‘George Pachymeres’
- Palermo Stone, *see* ‘chronicles, Egyptian’
- Palladius, missionary in Ireland, 213–14, 219
- Panodorus, Alexandrian chronographer, 125, 229, 345
- parataxis, as key characteristic of chronicles, 12, 17, 23–5, 29, 30, 59, 190, 208, 226, 231, 234, 240, 244, 249, 256, 257, 263, 271, 272, 357, 377
- Parian Marble, epigraphic Hellenistic chronicle, 20, 84–5, 86, 159, 187, 190 n3, 301–9, 336, 341, 363
- characteristics of, 22–3 n40, 24, 40, 77 n41, 87 n81, 95, 121, 124, 338, 339

- chronology of, 84, 85, 101, 337  
 shared source with Eusebius, 85–6, 101 n9, 122  
*Parousia*, *see* 'Christ, return of'  
*Paschale Campanum*, Latin paschal chronicle, 28, 55–6, 216, 324–7  
 and consularia, 54, 115, 179, 182, 183–4  
 and end of the world, 115–16  
 manuscript of, 264  
 Paul, apostle  
   epistles of, 114  
   'ordination' of, 50  
   and Peter, as martyrs, 49, 50, 114, 176  
 Paul the Deacon  
   *Historia Langobardorum*, 197–8, 243, 255  
   *Historia Romana*, 197, 198  
   as source, 247, 262, 265  
 Pausanias of Laconia, probable Greek chronicler, 282  
 'Pergamene chronicle', 84 n70, 365  
 Pertz, Georg, 1–2, 6, 21  
 Peter, apostle, *see* 'Paul, apostle'  
 Peter of Alexandria, Byzantine epitomator, 233 n117  
*Peterborough Chronicle*, 207  
 Phillis of Delos, probable Greek chronicler, 279  
 Philo of Alexandria, Jewish philosopher, 108–9  
 Philo of Byblos, *see* 'Herennius Philo'  
 Philochorus, Greek Arthidographer, 81, 82 n59  
 Philochorus, Greek Olympiad chronicler, 86, 363  
 Philodemus, Greek philosopher, 281 n8, 349, 353  
 Philoponus, Greek philosopher and commentator, on the eclipse at the time of the Crucifixion, 350, 351 n14, 381, 382  
 Phlegon of Tralles, Ὀλυμπιονικῶν καὶ χρονικῶν συναγωγῇ, 7 n12, 89–90, 283–4, 315–16  
 as chronicle, 20–1, 87 n81, 121, 281 n10, 285 and Eusebius, 121, 343–8, 350–3, 380, 381  
 Photius, *Bibliotheca*, 234  
 ancient authors preserved in, 90, 109, 121 n84, 283, 284  
 Plato  
   as imitator of earlier Jewish/Egyptian wisdom, 103 n17, 105, 106, 110, 112, 113  
   *Timaeus*, 100–1, 112  
 Pliny the Elder, Roman polymath  
   on Accius, 379  
   on chronicles, 283, 286  
   on Numa Pompilius and Pythagoras, 92 n95  
 Plutarch, Greek biographer  
   on chronicles, 269 n1, 358, 379  
   on χρονικοὶ κανόνες, 88 n85, 89, 341  
   on date of foundation of Rome, 371  
   on Numa Pompilius and Pythagoras, 92 n95, 358  
 Polemius Silvius, *Laterculus*, calendar of, 51, 138 n13, 148–50  
 Polybius, Greek historian of Rome, 95 n106, 372, 379  
 Polybius, late Hellenistic or early imperial historian, 365  
 Polyhistor, *see* 'Alexander Polyhistor'  
 Pompeius Trogus, 77, 95 n106, 127 n101, 238  
 Pomponius Atticus, T., *Liber annalis*, 7, 25, 26, 37, 91, 92 n97, 93–4, 95, 96, 97, 129, 155, 170, 171, 269 n1, 274, 294 n8  
 and Fasti Capitolini, 161 n75  
 and 'Varronian' AUC chronology, 136, 161 n75, 162, 371  
 Poole, R. L., 2, 190 n2, 237  
 Porcius Cato, M., Roman author, 139 n16, 355, 371  
 Porphyry, Greek philosopher  
   and Cassius Longinus, 349  
   Κατὰ Χριστιανῶν, 124  
   Eusebius and, 120, 121 n83, 124, 343, 344 n2, 352, 353, 380  
   and Olympic victor list, 345–6, 349  
   supposed chronicle of, 90 n87, 120 n82, 346, 363, 364–5  
 Posidonius of Apamea, Greek historian, 29  
 post-consulates, *see* 'chronological systems'  
 post-punk, 129 n103  
 Praxidica of Accius and Χρονικὰ πραξίδια of Timaeus, 379  
 Priscus of Panium, Greek historian, 270

- Procopius, sixth-century Byzantine historian, 48, 285, 286 n20
- Prologus Paschae*, short world chronology written in 395: 116 n66
- Prosper of Aquitaine, Latin chronicler, 277 n3, 287, 332–4
- chronology of, 31, 130
- cited as example of chronicle, 360
- and consularia and consuls, 37, 38 nn62 and 63, 49 n78, 57, 130, 176, 179, 183, 184, 185
- continued, 29, 38 n62, 57, 58, 186–7, 193, 202 n38
- continues Jerome, 21, 57, 184, 185, 187, 286
- editions of, 277 n2
- epitome of Jerome, *see* 'epitome of Jerome, Prosper's'
- fasti of, 54, 176
- and heresy in, 24, 49
- in Carolingian Renaissance, 238, 244, 264
- in Ireland, 214, 216, 217, 219
- Lucentius's version of, 286 n23
- manuscripts of, 264
- style, 17 n33, 24, 25, 26, 44, 53
- used as source, 40, 42, 186, 197, 201, 202, 206, 263, 265
- Ps-Apollodorus, *see* 'Apollodorus'
- Ps-Codinus, *see* 'Codinus'
- Ps-Dionysius, *see* 'Dionysius'
- Ps-Eupolemus, *see* 'Eupolemus'
- Ps-Hecataeus, *see* 'Hecataeus'
- Ps-Justin, *see* 'Cohortatio ad Graecos'
- Psellus, *see* 'Michael Psellus'
- 'Pseudo-Fredegarius', *see* 'Fredegar'
- Ptolemaic Canon*, Babylonian/Alexandrian/Roman king list, 75 n37
- Ptolemy of Alexandria, imperial Greek polymath, 75 n37, 229
- Ptolemy of Mendes, probable Greek chronicler, 106 n24, 112, 113, 280
- punk, 129 n103
- Pythagoras
- as imitator of Jewish/Egyptian wisdom, 104 n17, 106, 108, 112, 113
- as teacher of Numa Pompilius, 92–3, 143 n28, 358
- Quadrigarius, *see* 'Claudius Quadrigarius, C.'
- Radulphus de Diceto, *Abbreviationes chronorum*, 295 n10
- Regino of Prüm, *Chronicle*, 254–5, 261, 263, 267
- regnal lists, *see* 'king lists'
- regnal years, *see* 'chronological systems'
- Reichschroniken*, *see* 'Kleinchroniken'
- Religious Chronicle, Babylonian, 75 n39, 76, 77, 299–300
- Robert of Hereford, English bishop, 262
- Rome, foundation of, 40, 41, 94, 128, 136, 142 n22, 143 n28, 153, 159, 161–2, 371–3
- see also* 'ab urbe condita' under 'chronological systems'
- Rotense*, *see* 'Chronica Rotense'
- Royal Annals, Egyptian, *see* 'chronicles, Egyptian'
- Royal Chronicle of Lagash, Sumerian king list, 67
- Rudbeck, Olof, *Atlantica*, 103 n15
- Rufinus of Aquileia
- Apologia*, knowledge of Jerome's chronicle in, 286
- Historia ecclesiastica*, 23, 48, 127 n100, 204, 380
- in the Carolingian Renaissance, 238
- used as source 201, 206, 216, 253
- supposed chronicle of, 213 n72
- Rüpke, Jörg, 5 n9, 141 n21
- Saint-Martial of Limoges, 258–9 n197
- Sallust, Roman historian, 238, 291
- Sanchuniathon, Hellenistic Phoenician historian, 105 n23
- Scribonius Libo, L., *Liber annalis*, 91
- Scriptores Originum Constantinopolitanarum*, Byzantine miscellany, 182 n20, 223
- Scylitzes, John, Byzantine historian, 228, 231 n111, 235–6
- Seder Olam*, Jewish chronography, 109–10
- Sempronius Asellio, Roman historian
- disparaging of chronography, 269 n1, 357–8
- use of the word *annales*, 293–5

- Sempronius Tuditanus, C., Roman antiquarian, 92 n95, 144 n29
- Septuagint, *see* 'Old Testament'
- Shamash-suma-ukin Chronicle, Babylonian, 76
- Shulgi chronicle, Babylonian, 76
- Sicard of Cremona, Latin chronicler, 268 n230
- Sigebert of Gembloux  
*Chronica*, 8, 191, 256, 263, 265–8  
 work as chronicle, 21, 59–60, 256, 264  
*De uiris illustribus* of, 194
- Six Ages of the World, *see* 'chronological systems'
- Social War, *see* 'chronological systems'
- Sosibius of Laconia, probable Greek chronicler, 279, 342 n9
- Spanish era, *see* 'chronological systems'
- Star Trek*, 100 n3
- Stesiclides of Athens, Greek chronicler, 342 n9  
 possibly identical with Ctesicles, 280 n3, 363–4  
*see also* 'Ctesicles'
- Suda, Byzantine encyclopedia, 81, 280
- Sulpicius Severus, *Chronica*, 48, 127 n100  
 as chronicle, 5 n9  
 not a chronicle, 49 n77  
 on word '*chronica*', 286, 287 nn24 and 25  
 supposed universal chronicle of, 213 n72
- Symeon the Logothete, Byzantine historian, 7 n12, 231 n111  
 as *breviarium*, not chronicle, 30, 32, 62, 126 n98
- Συναγωγή χρόνων/*Liber generationis*, 98 n112, 117–19, 127  
 appears in *Chronographia Scaligeriana*, 50, 117 n74, 118  
 appears in Fredegar compilation, 117, 377, 378  
 as chronograph, 29–30, 61, 98 n112, 118–19, 337, 338, 341–2  
 manuscripts of, 117–18  
 not known to other chroniclers and chronographers, 119  
 not the work of Hippolytus, 98 n112, 117, 367, 368–9, 370–1
- Syncellus, George, *Εκλογή χρονογραφίας*, 89, 103, 111 n49, 227–30, 231, 232, 236, 254, 281  
 as annotated chronograph, 30, 61, 109, 116, 228, 231, 345 n3  
 and Berossus, 339, 342  
 chronology of, 228–30  
 and Eusebius, 85 n73, 123, 228–9, 229–30, 279 n1, 281 n8, 339, 342, 345 n3, 350, 381  
 and Julius Africanus, 30, 61, 115 n64, 121 n85, 119, 229, 230, 351 n14  
 and Hippolytus, 368, 369  
 and Panodorus and Annianus, 115 n64, 229, 369  
 and Thallus, 350  
 and Theophanes, 30, 227–8, 230–1, 232, 236, 254  
 title of, 228
- Synchronistic History, Assyrian, 71, 78 n46
- Tacitus, Roman historian, and the titles of his two major histories, 5 n9, 18 n35, 292 n5
- Tatian, *Oratio ad Graecos*, 111, 112, 283 n14, 366  
 and Eusebius, 119, 347–8, 366
- Terentius Varro, M., Roman chronicler and antiquarian, 91, 92 n95, 93 n101, 94 n102, 139, 145, 164, 170, 274
- Annales*, 91  
 on date of foundation of Rome, 162, 371  
 Republican chronology of, 92 n97, 136, 161 n77, 162, 354–5  
 dictator years, fictitious Varronian, 136 n7, 161 n75, 372
- Tertullian, *Apologeticum*, 111, 113, 127, 350  
*see also* '*Fragmentum Fuldense*'
- Thallus, Greek historian, 112, 343–53, 365, 381
- Thegan, Carolingian biographer, 239, 289
- Theodorus Scutariotes, *Σύνοψις χρονική*, 27 n44, 30, 62, 232 n113  
 on the chronicle genre, 14 n25
- Theophanes, *Χρονογραφία*, 227–8, 230–2, 233, 236, 254, 261  
 as chronicle, 21, 30, 31, 190 n3, 203, 230–1, 232, 236, 261  
 and consularia, 47, 54, 55 n89, 179, 226 n93, 361  
 and Malalas, 223 n80



- sources of, 203, 226 n93, 227, 230, 233  
 and Syriac chronicles, 227  
 used as source 231  
*see also* 'Syncellus, George'
- Theophanes Continuatus, anonymous Byzantine historian, 231 n112
- Theophilus, Christian apologist, 111, 112, 114, 116, 117 n70  
*anni mundi* chronology of, 115 n62  
 and Eusebius, 120  
 and Thallus, 350–3
- Theophylact Simocatta, Greek historian, 191, 230
- Thrasylus, late Hellenistic or early imperial historian, 365
- Tigernach Ua Braein, Abbot of Clonmacnoise, 211
- Tiglath-pileser I chronicle, Assyrian, 72
- Timaeus of Tauromenium, Greek historian, 29, 101 n9, 378–9  
 and Olympiad chronology, 86, 364  
 on date of foundation of Rome, 371
- Timocritus, probable Greek chronicler, 280 n6
- Tírechán, Irish biographer, 219
- Tivoli fragments, of epigraphic fasti, 169
- tribunicia potestas*, *see* 'chronological systems'
- Trogus, *see* 'Pompeius Trogus'
- Troy, fall of, date of, 86 n77, 87 n79, 101 n9, 124, 364–5, 371–2, 374  
 as beginning of chronicle of Apollodorus, 87, 353  
 as beginning of chronicle of Eratosthenes, 86  
 as beginning of history of Thallus, 351–2, 353  
 as chronological linchpin, 27, 86–7, 114 n57, 338, 351, 352, 364–5, 371, 372  
 in Frankish history, 242, 258, 378
- Tubero, *see* 'Aelius Tubero'
- Tukulti-Ninurta chronicle, Assyrian, 72
- Tullius Cicero, M.  
 and Atticus's *Liber annalis*, 7, 25, 26, 27, 94 n103, 96, 129, 269 n1, 274  
 birth and death of, recorded, 96 n107, 149  
*Brutus*, 26, 94, 274  
*Cato*, 25, 26, 94, 274  
 and eclipse of 400 BC, 142 n24  
 and fasti, 11 n20, 134 n3, 150 n52, 157 n68  
 on 'annals', 94, 269 n1, 292, 293 n7, 294, 295, 359  
 on Fulvius, 373  
 on history, 7, 294 n9  
 on intercalation, 139 n16  
 and Pythagorean books, 92–3  
 'uno in conspectu', as a key aspect of chronicles, 26, 27, 30, 94, 96, 206, 231, 243, 244, 256, 264, 266
- Tummal chronicle, Sumerian historical text, 67–8
- Valerius Antias, Roman historian, 92 n95, 93, 94
- Varro, *see* 'Terentius Varro, M.'
- Velleius Paterculus, Roman epitomator, 23, 31, 61, 96–7, 127 n101, 151 n56  
 in Carolingian period, 238  
 on calculating consular dates, 134 n3  
 on date of foundation of Rome, 371
- Verbrughe, Gerald P., 293 n7
- Verrius Flaccus, M., Roman antiquarian, 96, 161  
 fasti of, 144–6, 147, 148, 154–5, 156, 170, 374  
 on meaning of *annales*, 291–2  
*see also* 'Fasti Praenestini'
- Victor of Tunnuna, Latin chronicler, 3, 21, 182, 186–7, 202, 263  
 as continuator of Jerome-Prosper, 29, 38 n62, 57, 186–7, 191, 192, 193  
 chronology of, 38 n62, 182  
 and *Consularia CaesarAugustana*, 54, 180, 196  
 continued by John of Biclar, 29, 38 n62, 57, 180, 187, 191, 192, 193  
 and Isidore, 31 n50, 201, 359
- Victorius of Aquitaine, *Cursus Paschalis*, 26, 56, 183, 277, 286–7
- Walafrid Strabo, Carolingian poet, theologian, and scholar, 289
- Walker Chronicle, Babylonian, 76
- weeks of years, *see* 'chronological systems'
- Weidner Chronicle, Babylonian, 76
- Widukind of Corvey, Saxon historian, 266
- William of Malmesbury, English historian, 204, 256
- Wulfstan of Worcester, English bishop, 262

Xenagoras, probable Greek chronicler, 280  
 Xenocrates, probable Greek chronicler, 282  
 year-names, *see* 'chronological systems'  
 Yose ben Halafta, rabbinic scholar, 109

Zeno, Greek chronicler, 280 n6, 281 n8  
*Zhushu jinian*/Bamboo Annals, Chinese, 79  
 n49, 360  
 Zonaras, *Annales*, 231 n111, 235 n130  
*breviarium* not chronicle, 30, 62

## STUDIES IN THE EARLY MIDDLE AGES

All volumes in this series are evaluated by an Editorial Board, strictly on academic grounds, based on reports prepared by referees who have been commissioned by virtue of their specialism in the appropriate field. The Board ensures that the screening is done independently and without conflicts of interest. The definitive texts supplied by authors are also subject to review by the Board before being approved for publication. Further, the volumes are copyedited to conform to the publisher's stylebook and to the best international academic standards in the field.

### Titles in Series

Dawn M. Hadley and Julian D. Richards (eds), *Cultures in Contact: Scandinavian Settlement in England in the Ninth and Tenth Centuries* (2000)

Andrew Gillett (ed.), *On Barbarian Identity: Critical Approaches to Ethnicity in the Early Middle Ages* (2002)

Matthew Townend, *Language and History in Viking Age England: Linguistic Relations between Speakers of Old Norse and Old English* (2002)

James H. Barrett (ed.), *Contact, Continuity, and Collapse: The Norse Colonization of the North Atlantic* (2003)

Catherine Cubitt (ed.), *Court Culture in the Early Middle Ages: The Proceedings of the First Alcuin Conference* (2003)

P. S. Barnwell and Marco Mostert (eds), *Political Assemblies in the Earlier Middle Ages* (2003)

Matthew Townend (ed.), *Wulfstan, Archbishop of York: The Proceedings of the Second Alcuin Conference* (2004)

Florin Curta (ed.), *Borders, Barriers, and Ethnogenesis: Frontiers in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages* (2006)

John D. Niles, *Old English Enigmatic Poems and the Play of the Texts* (2006)

Sally N. Vaughn and Jay Rubenstein (eds), *Teaching and Learning in Northern Europe, 1000–1200* (2006)

Elizabeth M. Tyler and Ross Balzaretti (eds), *Narrative and History in the Early Medieval West* (2006)

Wendy Davies, Guy Halsall, and Andrew Reynolds (eds), *People and Space in the Middle Ages, 300–1300* (2006)

John D. Niles, *Old English Heroic Poems and the Social Life of Texts* (2007)

Celia Chazelle and Catherine Cubitt (eds), *The Crisis of the Oikoumene: The Three Chapters and the Failed Quest for Unity in the Sixth-Century Mediterranean* (2007)

Alastair Minnis and Jane Roberts (eds), *Text, Image, Interpretation: Studies in Anglo-Saxon Literature and its Insular Context in Honour of Éamonn Ó Carragáin* (2007)

Aaron J Kleist (ed.), *The Old English Homily: Precedent, Practice, and Appropriation* (2007)

James T. Palmer, *Anglo-Saxons in a Frankish World, 690–900* (2009)

Patricia Skinner (ed.), *Challenging the Boundaries of Medieval History: The Legacy of Timothy Reuter* (2009)

Peter Verbist, *Duelling with the Past: Medieval Authors and the Problem of the Christian Era, c. 990–1135* (2010)

Alice Jorgensen (ed.), *Reading the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: Language, Literature, History* (2010)

David Rollason, Conrad Leyser, and Hannah Williams (eds), *England and the Continent in the Tenth Century: Studies in Honour of Wilhelm Levison (1876–1947)* (2010)

David Petts and Sam Turner (eds), *Early Medieval Northumbria: Kingdoms and Communities, 450–1100* (2011)

Elizabeth M. Tyler (ed.), *Conceptualizing Multilingualism in Medieval England, c. 800–c. 1250* (2011)

Florin Curta (ed.), *Neglected Barbarians* (2011)

Matthew T. Hussey and John D. Niles (eds), *The Genesis of Books: Studies in the Scribal Culture of Medieval England in Honour of A. N. Doane* (2011)

Giselle de Nie, *Poetics of Wonder: Testimonies of the New Christian Miracles in the Late Antique Latin World* (2012)

## In Preparation

John Baker, Stuart Brookes, and Andrew Reynolds (eds), *Landscapes of Defence in Early Medieval Europe*

Lilla Kopár, *Gods and Settlers: The Iconography of Norse Mythology in Anglo-Scandinavian Sculpture*

Sara M. Pons-Sanz, *The Lexical Effects of Anglo-Scandinavian Linguistic Contact on Old English*

Sæbjørg Wälaker Nordeide and Stefan Brink (eds), *Sacred Sites and Holy Places: Exploring the Sacralization of Landscape through Space and Time*